Passionate Platonism: Plutarch on the Positive Role of Non-Rational Affects in the Good Life

by

David Ryan Morphew

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Classical Studies)
in The University of Michigan
2018

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Victor Caston, Chair
Professor Sara Ahbel-Rappe
Professor Richard Janko
Professor Arlene Saxonhouse

David Ryan Morphew

morphewd@umich.edu

ORCID iD: 0000-0003-4773-4952

DEDICATION

To my wife, Renae, whom
I met as I began this project,
and who has supported me
throughout its development.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I am grateful to my advisors and dissertation committee for their encouragement, support, challenges, and constructive feedback. I am chiefly indebted to Victor Caston for his comments on successive versions of chapters, for his great insight and foresight in guiding me in the following project, and for steering me to work on Plutarch's *Moralia* in the first place. No less am I thankful for what he has taught me about being a scholar, mentor, and teacher, by his advice and especially by his example. There is not space here to express in any adequate way my gratitude also to Sara Ahbel-Rappe and Richard Janko. They have been constant sources of inspiration. I continue to be in awe of their ability to provide constructive criticism and to give incisive critiques coupled with encouragement and suggestions. I am also indebted to Arlene Saxonhouse for helping me to see the scope and import of the following thesis not only as of interest to the history of philosophy but also in teaching our students to reflect on the kind of life that we want to live.

I have been very fortunate and greatly blessed by excellent advisors, mentors, and teachers throughout my journey at the University of Michigan, the University of Colorado at Boulder, and Baylor University. Most of all, I must thank Jeff Fish. As a great teacher and mentor, Jeff first instilled a love for Greek and the Classics and set me on this path. He has been a constant source of encouragement and a good friend.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Collections of Ancient Texts:

DK	Hermann A. Diels and Walter Kranz (edd.) 1951–2, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th revised edn. (orig. 1903), 3 vols., Berlin: Weidmann.
FGrH	Jacobi, Felix (ed.) 1923–1959, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin: Weidmann.
LS	Anthony A. Long and David N. Sedley (edd.) 1987, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, 2 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
SVF	Hans von Arnim (ed.) 1903–5 (repr. 1964), *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, 3 vols., Leipzig: Teubner; Maximilian Adler (1924), vol. 4 (Indices), Stuttgart: Teubner.

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias:

LSJ	Henry G. Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry S. Jones (edd.) 1996, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edn., with a revised suppl., Oxford: Clarendon Press.
SEP	Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Stanford: The Metaphysics Research Lab Center for the Study of Language and Information, https://plato.stanford.edu/

Ancient Authors:

D.L.	Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, in Miroslav Marcovich (ed.) 1999, *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum*, 3 vols., Stuttgart: Teubner.
S.E.	Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* and *Against the Professors*, in Jürgen Mau and Hermann Mutschmann (edd.) 1912–14, *Sexti Empirici opera*, 3 vols., Leipzig: Teubner.
Stob.	Stobaeus, *Anthology*, in Otto Hense and Curt Wachsmuth (edd.) 1884–1912 (repr. 1958), *Ioannis Stobaei anthologium*, 5 vols., Berlin: Weidmann.

LIST OF PLUTARCH'S WORKS CITED

Plutarch's *Moralia*:

How a Young Man Should Read Poetry = *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* (*Πῶς δεῖ τὸν νέον ποιημάτων ἀκούειν*)
On Listening to Lectures = *De recta ratione audiendi* (*Περὶ τοῦ ἀκούειν*)
How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend = *Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur* (*Πῶς ἄν τις διακρίνειε τὸν κόλακα τοῦ φίλου*)
On Moral Progres = *Quomodo quis suos in virtute sentiat profectus* (*Πῶς ἄν τις αἴσθοιτο ἑαυτοῦ προκόπτοντος ἐπ᾽ ἀρετῇ*)
How to Profit by One's Enemies = *De capienda ex inimicis utilitate* (*Πῶς ἄν τις ὑπ᾽ ἐχθρῶν ὠφελοῖτο*)
On Having Many Friends = *De amicorum multitudine* (*Περὶ πολυφιλίας*)
On Virtue and Vice = *De virtute et vitio* (*Περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας*)
Consolation to Apollonius = *Consolatio ad Apollonium* (*Παραμυθητικὸς πρὸς Ἀπολλώνιον*)
Advice on Keeping Well = *De tuenda sanitate praecepta* (*Ὑγιεινὰ παραγγέλματα*)
Advice to Bride and Groom = *Coniugalia praecepta* (*Γαμικὰ παραγγέλματα*)
Dinner of the Seven Wise Men = *Septem sapientium convivium* (*Τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν συμπόσιον*)
On Superstition = *De superstitione* (*Περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας*)
Sayings of Kings and Emperors = *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* (*Ἀποφθέγματα βασιλέων καὶ στρατηγῶν*)
Sayings of the Spartans = *Apophthegmata Laconica* (*Ἀποφθέγματα Λακωνικά*)
Bravery of Women = *Mulierum virtutes* (*Γυναικῶν ἀρεταί*)
Roman Questions = *Quaestiones Romanae* (*Αἴτια Ῥωμαϊκά*)
On the Great Fortune or Virtue of Alexander 1 and 2 = *De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute, libri ii* (*Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τύχης ἢ ἀρετῆς, λόγοι β΄*)
On Isis and Osiris = *De Iside et Osiride* (*Περὶ Ἴσιδος καὶ Ὀσίριδος*)
On the E at Delphi = *De E apud Delphos* (*Περὶ τοῦ ΕΙ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς*)
On the Oracles at Delphi = *De Pythiae oraculis* (*Περὶ τοῦ μὴ χρᾶν ἔμμετρα νῦν τὴν Πυθίαν*)
On the Obsolescence of Oracles = *De defectu oraculorum* (*Περὶ τῶν ἐκλελοιπότων χρηστηρίων*)
Can Virtue be Taught = *An virtus doceri possit* (*Εἰ διδακτὸν ἡ ἀρετή*)
On Moral Virtue = *De virtute morali* (*Περὶ τῆς ἠθικῆς ἀρετῆς*)
On the Control of Anger = *De cohibenda ira* (*Περὶ ἀοργησίας*)
On Tranquility of Mind = *De tranquillitate animi* (*Περὶ εὐθυμίας*)
On Brotherly Love = *De fraterno amore* (*Περὶ φιλαδελφίας*)
On Affection for Offspring = *De amore prolis* (*Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ ἔκγονα φιλοστοργίας*)

Whether Vice is Sufficient for Unhappiness = *An vitiositas ad infelicitatem sufficiat* (*Εἰ αὐτάρκης ἡ κακία πρὸς κακοδαιμονίαν*)
Whether the Affections of the Soul are Worse Than Those of the Body = *Animine an corporis affectiones sint peiores* (*Πότερον τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἢ τὰ τοῦ σώματος πάθη χείρονα*)
On Talkativeness = *De garrulitate* (*Περὶ ἀδολεσχίας*)
On Being a Busybody = *De curiositate* (*Περὶ πολυπραγμοσύνης*)
On Compliancy = *De vitioso pudore* (*Περὶ δυσωπίας*)
On Envy and Hate = *De invidia et odio* (*Περὶ φθόνου καὶ μίσους*)
On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance = *De sera numinis vindicta* (*Περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ θείου βραδέως τιμωρουμένων*)
On Exile = *De exilio* (*Περὶ φυγῆς*)
On the Sign of Socrates = *De genio Socratis* (*Περὶ τοῦ Σωκράτους δαιμονίου*)
Consolation to His Wife = *Consolatio ad uxorem* (*Παραμυθητικὸς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα*)
Table-Talk = *Quaestionum convivalium libri ix* (*Συμποσιακῶν προβλημάτων βιβλία θ΄*)
Dialogue on Love = *Amatorius* (*Ἐρωτικός*)
Philosophers and Men in Power = *Maxime cum principibus philosopho esse disserendum* (*Περὶ τοῦ ὅτι μάλιστα τοῖς ἡγεμόσι δεῖ τὸν φιλόσοφον διαλέγεσθαι*)
To an Uneducated Ruler = *Ad principem ineruditum* (*Πρὸς ἡγεμόνα ἀπαίδευτον*)
Whether an Old Man Should Engage in Politics = *An seni respublica gerenda sit* (*Εἰ πρεσβυτέρῳ πολιτευτέον*)
Precepts of Stagecraft = *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* (*Πολιτικὰ παραγγέλματα*)
Causes of Natural Phenomena = *Questiones Naturales* (*Αἰτίαι φυσικαί*)
On the Face in the Moon = *De facie quae in orbe lunae apparet* (*Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης*)
On the Principle of Cold = *De primo frigido* (*Περὶ τοῦ πρώτως ψυχροῦ*)
On the Cleverness of Animals = *Terrestriane an aquatilia animalia sint callidiora* (*Πότερα τῶν ζῴων φρονιμώτερα τὰ χερσαῖα ἢ τὰ ἔννυδρα*)
Beasts are Rational = *Bruta animalia ratione uti, sive Gryllus* (*Περὶ τοῦ τὰ ἄλογα λόγῳ χρῆσθαι*)
On the Eating of Flesh 1 and 2 = *De esu carnium orationes ii (Περὶ σαρκοφαγίας λόγοι β΄)*
Platonic Questions = *Platonicae quaestiones* (*Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα*)
On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus = *De animae procreatione in Timaeo* (*Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας*)
On Stoic Self-Contradictions = *De Stoicorum repugnantiis* (*Περὶ Στωικῶν ἐναντιωμάτων*)
On Common Notions = *De communibus notitiis adversus Stoicos* (*Περὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἐννοιῶν πρὸς τοὺς Στωικούς*)
That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible = *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* (*Ὅτι οὐδὲ ζῆν ἔστιν ἡδέως κατ᾽ Ἐπίκουρον*)
Reply to Colotes = *Adversus Colotem* (*Πρὸς Κωλώτην ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων φιλοσόφων*)
Whether "Live Unknown" is a Wise Precept = *An recte dictum sit latenter esse vivendum* (*Εἰ καλῶς εἴρηται τὸ λάθε βιώσας*)

Sandbach fragments (frr.) refer to the collection in Francis H. Sandbach (ed.) 1967, *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 7, Leipzig: Teubner.[1]

Plutarch's *Lives* are cited by single names, with Greek names in Latinized form, and by conjoined names for the comparisons of lives, e.g. *Lycurgus* for Plutarch's biography on Lycurgus, the legendary founder of the Spartan constitution, and *Lycurgus and Numa* for the comparison of Lycurgus and Numa Pompilius, the legendary second king of Rome.

[1] This collection can also be found, with translations, in the Loeb series: Francis H. Sandbach (ed. and trans.) 1969, *Plutarch, Moralia*, vol. XV, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

ABSTRACT

My dissertation urges a reconsideration of Plutarch's importance as a philosopher. Plutarch is well known for his biographies and as a source for other authors, but not for original views of his own. A study that attempts to understand Plutarch sympathetically is surprisingly untried. Far from the uncharitable perception of Plutarch as a mere eclectic disseminator of popular philosophy, Plutarch offers a distinctive and appealing ethical view, neglected in the history of philosophy, which affirms the centrality of our passions in ethical development and their essential place in the good life. It is a refreshing alternative to the overly rationalistic tradition of Stoicism, the main philosophical rival of Plutarch's day. It is also different from other forms of Platonism. It does not ask us to abandon familiar, positive features of our emotional life and intimacy with others, unlike the otherworldly Platonisms we often find later in antiquity.

I explore the centrality of passions in Plutarch's moral philosophy primarily through the close reading of his ethical writings, the *Moralia*, vis-à-vis Plato's dialogues, the traditions spawned from Plato's Academy, and rival philosophical schools. In the Introduction to my dissertation, I begin with Plutarch's presentation of himself as part of the continuing tradition of Plato's Academy, a living tradition for Plutarch that is united, from Socrates to his own day, by a commitment to critical reflection rather than by a commitment to a set of dogmas or doctrines. Given this view of Plato's Academy, Plutarch takes a distinctive position in holding that

emotions and emotional vulnerability are essential to social virtues and genuine concern for other individuals, in contrast with Stoicism. I take up this point in Chapter 1 of my dissertation, where I examine Plutarch's criticisms of the rival ethical theory of Stoic "appropriation" or "identification" (*oikeiōsis*) which Plutarch argues ironically *alienates* us from our own human nature and from other human beings. In Chapter 2, I explore Plutarch's Platonic psychology and analyze his arguments on the appropriateness and naturalness of grief. Plutarch's position that passions should be moderated and serve specific purposes sits in contrast with the advice to minimize and eradicate emotions such as grief as far as one is able in Plato's *Republic*. In Chapter 3, I show that for Plutarch passions are not only ineradicable aspects of embodied life, but are also necessary for acting in the world, can enhance and intensify virtuous action, and can aid in the pursuit of virtue. Life with passions is better than without them. Chapter 4 is an examination of the positive role that shame plays in correcting one's actions and character in Plutarch's moral psychology. In Chapter 5, I turn to the prominent role emotions play in the formation of character. In contrast to the Old Academy, Plutarch argues that the most important preparation for the virtuous life begins with the formation of our passionate nature in childhood. In Chapter 6, I argue that Plutarch provides an alternative theory of moral development to the Stoic theory of *oikeiōsis*, placing the passion of affection at the heart of our social development. Affection serves as the seed, as it were, of our ever-expanding sense of identification with others. As we attempt to fulfill our nature in imitation of the divine (*homoiōsis theōi*), we cultivate divine qualities while remaining fully human with passions.

INTRODUCTION

οὐκ "ἀνδριαντοποιός" ἐστιν ὁ τῆς φιλοσοφίας λόγος, "ὥστ' ἐλινύοντα ποιεῖν ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος ἑσταότα" κατὰ Πίνδαρον· ἀλλ' ἐνεργὰ βούλεται ποιεῖν ὧν ἂν ἅψηται καὶ πρακτικὰ καὶ ἔμψυχα καὶ κινητικὰς ὁρμὰς ἐντίθησι καὶ κρίσεις ἀγωγοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ὠφέλιμα καὶ προαιρέσεις φιλοκάλους καὶ φρόνημα καὶ μέγεθος μετὰ πραότητος καὶ ἀσφαλείας, δι' ὧν τοῖς ὑπερέχουσι καὶ δυνατοῖς ὁμιλοῦσιν οἱ πολιτικοὶ προθυμότερον.

The purpose of philosophy is not "statue-making, with the result that one makes statues that rest without moving, standing still upon their own base" as Pindar puts it [*Nemean Ode* 5.1–3], but it is wont to make whatever it touches active, effective, and full of life. It establishes within one active impulses and judgments that lead to what is beneficial, policies that aim at what is noble, and thoughtfulness and greatness with gentleness and security. Through these characteristics those engaged in politics more eagerly associate with those who are powerful and in power.
(Plutarch, *Philosophers and Men in Power* 776C8–D3)

§I The Purpose and Scope of This Study

Following a particularly negative evaluation of Plutarch's philosophical work, which prevailed throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, scholars have shown a renewed interest in Plutarch as both a writer and thinker in the last few decades. Recent collections of essays, conferences and workshops, and numerous articles and books that explore Plutarch's views in their own right attest to this renewed interest and reevaluation of Plutarch's significance and his contribution to philosophy.[1] But Plutarch has not, in my view, been fully

[1] See, for instance, recent collections of essays, such as Mossman 1997, Bonazzi and Opsomer 2009, Roskam and Van der Stockt 2011, Roig Lanzillotta and Muñoz Gallarte 2012, Beck 2014, Meeusen and Van der Stockt 2015, Opsomer, Roskam, and Titchener 2016, and Meeusen 2017. See also work from conventions in Gallo 1992; Pérez Jiménez, García Lopez and Aguilar 1999; Hirsch-Luipold 2005; and Volpe Cacciatore and Ferrari 2007. Notable book-length examinations by a single author include Ingenkamp 1971 and Van Hoof 2010, who examine Plutarch's psychotherapeutic works, Kechagia 2011 and Corti 2014, who analyze Plutarch's philosophical arguments in *Reply to Colotes*, and Xenophontos 2016, who provides a detailed study of education in Plutarch's *Moralia* and *Lives*. Plutarch's philosophy and approach to philosophy have been analyzed in detail in Babut 1969a, 1969b, and his collection of essays in Babut 1994; Becchi 1975, 1978, 1981, 1996, 1999, 2005, and 2014; Tarrant 1985; Opsomer 1994, 1998, 2004, 2005, 2012, and 2014; Boys-Stones 1997a, 1997b, 2014, and 2017; Karamanolis 2006 and 2014; Shiffman 2010; and Bonazzi 2012a, 2012b. This list, which is representative of recent work that has focused on Plutarch as an intelligent writer and philosopher, is far from exhaustive. I mention other works below.

appreciated for the most attractive and distinctive feature of his own articulation of Platonic philosophy. I have chosen to draw out what I believe to be the most important and appealing feature that underlies Plutarch's thought on moral virtue throughout both the *Moralia* and the *Lives*: the *centrality of passions* to human nature, moral progress, and the ideal human life.[2]

Plutarch argues that passions are necessary components to this life. They are not necessary as evils due to embodiment but rather as part of our human nature. We must develop our passions. We become morally virtuous individuals through the proper education of our passions. As we work to fulfill our nature, our passions remain integral to it. Even as we attempt to become like god, we imitate the benevolence of god with the whole of human nature, which, for Plutarch, includes our passionate nature. Plutarch thus has a distinctive and compelling view of passions and their role in the moral and good life. His affirmation of human passion is in many ways surprisingly modern and unusual for his time period. Plutarch's positive evaluation of the passions and embodied human nature is also refreshing and provides an alternative kind of life, especially compared to the austere, passionless tranquility advocated by the Stoics and the other-worldly ideal of becoming like god by leaving this world and the passions behind, which we find in some Platonists.[3]

---

[2] I have recently come across Machek 2018, who attempts to address the centrality of passions in Plutarch's moral philosophy. Machek also discusses many of the same metaphors and descriptions of passions that I explore in this dissertation, such as the description of moral virtue as a compound with reason as its form and passion as its matter, the metaphor of taming the passions like animals, and the metaphor of cultivating our passions like plants. However, I find the conclusions Machek reaches unsatisfactory largely based on his approach and assumptions. From the outset, Machek writes that Plutarch's view may not be coherent or part of a unified view. In taking this approach, his position is similar to that of Nikolaidis 1991 (pp. 169–71) and Spanneut 1994 (pp. 4704–11). Machek writes that Plutarch's "polyphony" may be "just a plurality of more or less mutually incommensurable views." Though non-committal, Machek really stresses what he finds to be incoherent and incommensurable in Plutarch's works. As will be clear in what follows, I take Plutarch to be an intelligent writer whose moral philosophy forms a whole with parts that are consistent. I also take Plutarch's philosophy overall to describe a kind of life in which passions are integral and can contribute positively to our moral progress and to the good life itself.

[3] I touch on these points below in §V.c. and more fully in Chapter 6.

In this study, I focus primarily on Plutarch's philosophical corpus, the *Moralia*. I do not, however, shy away from many sections of the *Lives* that demonstrate the nuanced inflections that Plutarch develops as part of his moral philosophy. The many asides, critiques, and applications of Plutarch's own philosophical worldview in the *Lives* not only shed more light on Plutarch's own position, but also reveal the extent to which Plutarch's philosophical project permeates and informs his work. Taken together, Plutarch's biographical and non-biographical works lay out philosophical points for his readers in a variety of formats for consumption with remarkably vivid descriptions and metaphors.

Before providing an outline of each chapter in §VI below, I provide a short background of Plutarch's life (§II). I also provide a brief history on the perception of Plutarch as a philosopher and writer for the last century and a half (§III). I then provide an overview of my own understanding of Plutarch's self-conscious identification as part of the Platonic Academy, his understanding of the Platonic Academy as a living tradition (§IV), and several tenets that Plutarch holds to be central to Platonic philosophy (§V).

§II Plutarch: A Philosophical and Political Life

Born around 46 C.E.,[4] Plutarch spent most of his life in his home town of Chaeronea.[5] He was a prolific writer. The so-called Lamprias Catalogue[6] alone attributes 227 titles to Plutarch,

[4] The date is inferred from Plutarch's comments. Plutarch mentions that he was present for a conversation between his teacher, Ammonius, and Nero at Delphi (*On the E at Delphi* 385B). Nero visited Delphi around 66 C.E. So, assuming that Plutarch was around twenty years of age when he became a student of Ammonius, he was probably born around 46 C.E. For Nero's visit to Greece and Delphi see Suetonius, *Nero* 25.1; Cassius Dio 63.14.2. Cf. Jones 1971, pp. 13–19; Dillon 1977, pp. 189–90; Donini 1986. On Plutarch's life and political engagements see Jones 1971, pp. 20–38; Russell 1973; Centrone 2000, pp. 575–6; Van Hoof 2010, pp. 66–80; and Karamanolis 2014, "1. Life and Works." Cf. also Hirzel 1912, pp. 5–22; Flacelière 1964, pp. 1–28; and Barrow 1967.

[5] Cf. Russell 1968 and 1973, esp. pp. 1–17.

[6] On the date and reliability of the Lamprias Catalogue see Treu 1873, who conjectures that the list was compiled as a catalogue of texts for a library in the third or fourth century C.E. The attribution to Lamprias, son of Plutarch, is inferred from an anonymous introductory letter attached to the MS Neapolitanus III. B 29 (D.L.), which has the Catalogue on foll. 246 verso and 247. (Wachsmuth collated and attributed this MS to the fourteenth century C.E.

nearly half of which have been lost.[7] Apart from the Lamprias Catalogue, we have genuine works of Plutarch not listed in the Lamprias Catalogue that have been preserved in Maximus Planudes' compilation of the late thirteenth–early fourteenth century C.E., which remains the basic collection of Plutarch's works.[8]

Though he spent most of his life in Chaeronea, Plutarch lived a politically engaged life as a member of the Greek elite under Roman rule.[9] Plutarch was at one point the eponymous archon of Chaeronea.[10] He led an embassy to Achaea[11] and participated in several other embassies to Rome.[12] Plutarch also served as a priest of Apollo at Delphi, which features thematically in several of his works.[13] He was honored with the *ornamenta consularia* by Trajan[14] and was appointed the procurator of Achaea by Hadrian shortly before his death around 120 C.E.[15]

As I will discuss below, Plutarch identified as part of the Platonic tradition, which he considered to be a unified tradition that extended back to Socrates. Plutarch studied philosophy in Athens under the Egyptian Platonist, Ammonius, who is a prominent *persona* in several of

---

See Wachsmuth 1863, p. 577.) The *Suda* also attributes a list of Plutarch's works to his son, Lamprias (*Λ* 96 Adler): "Lamprias: son of Plutarch of Chaeronea. He wrote a Catalogue of his father's works on all of Greek and Roman history" (Λαμπρίας, Πλουτάρχου τοῦ Χαιρωνέως υἱός. ἔγραψε Πίνακα ὧν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἔγραψε περὶ πάσης Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἱστορίας). See also Sandbach's introduction to the Lamprias Catalogue in *Moralia*, vol. XV of the Loeb series (pp. 3–7).

[7] Around 130 works listed, apart from the *Lives*, appear to be lost. A few works listed are spuriously attributed to Plutarch, such as Aristotle's *Topics* (no. 56 in the Lamprias Catalogue).

[8] Cf. Russell 1973, pp. 18–19 and 147.

[9] Cf. Preston 2001.

[10] *Table-Talk* 642F. Cf. *ibid*. 693F, *Precepts of Statecraft* 811A–B.

[11] *Precepts of Statecraft* 816C–D. Cf. Centrone 2000, pp. 575–6.

[12] *Roman Questions* 275B–C, *Precepts of Statecraft* 805A, *On Exile* 602C, *Reply to Colotes* 1126E.

[13] Plutarch mentions his role as a priest in *Table-Talk* 700E. Among Plutarch's *Moralia*, several works are concerned with Plutarch's identification as a Platonist and his understanding of religion, such as *On the E at Delphi*, *On the Oracles at Delphi*, *On the Obsolescence of Oracles*, *On Isis and Osiris*, *On the Sign of Socrates*, and *Platonic Questions* 1. Among lost works listed in the Lamprias Catalogue, we also have titles that suggest a defense of Academic skepticism as compatible with religion and prophecy, such as no. 71: *On the Prophetic Art, That It is Preserved According to the Academy* (*Περὶ μαντικῆς ὅτι σῴζεται κατὰ τοὺς Ἀκαδημαϊκούς*) and no. 131: *On the Fact that the Principle of the Academy is not in Conflict with the Art of Prophecy* (*Περὶ τοῦ μὴ μάχεσθαι τῇ μαντικῇ τὸν Ἀκαδημαϊκὸν λόγον*).

[14] *Suda*, *Π* 1793 Adler.

[15] Syncellus, p. 626 Mosshammer. On the date of Plutarch's death see Jones 1966, p. 66.

Plutarch's dialogues.[16] Plutarch later became a teacher of philosophy with disciples of his own and developed a kind of mini-Academy about himself.[17] He attempted to live out his own advice and the ideal that he describes in the quotation I have provided in the epigram to the introduction: philosophy's purpose is to make humans actively engaged in life and politics.

§III Perceptions of Plutarch: Reconsidering Eclecticism

From the mid-nineteenth through the mid-twentieth century, Plutarch was treated as an entertaining biographer who provided a window into the past.[18] The rise of intense interest in *Quellenforschung* combined with Eduard Zeller's work on Plutarch, which framed him within a Hegelian view of the development of philosophy,[19] brought with it a low estimation of Plutarch's own philosophical contributions. His philosophical works were mined for quotations and testimonia of earlier philosophers, historians, playwrights, etc.[20] Apart from providing evidence of other "more important" writers and movements in the ancient world, Plutarch's own philosophical *oeuvre* was considered of little value. As Christopher Jones writes in the preface to *Plutarch and Rome*,

---

[16] On Ammonius' philosophical views our best evidence is inferred from what Plutarch puts in the mouth of his *persona* as an interlocutor in *On the E at Delphi* (391E–394C) and *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* (410F–414C), and in books 3, 8, and 9 of *Table-Talk*. According to the Lamprias Catalogue, Plutarch also appears to have written another work on Ammonius that has not survived: *Ammonius, Or On Not Finding Pleasure in Involvement with Vice* (*Ἀμμώνιος, ἢ περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἡδέως τῇ κακίᾳ συνεῖναι*), no. 84. On Ammonius's philosophical position and role in Academic legacy see Opsomer 2009. Cf. also Jones 1967; Dillon 1977, pp. 189–92; Donini 1986, pp. 108–19; Puech 1992, pp. 4835–6, 4886–9; Opsomer 1998, pp. 21–5, 129–31, 142–79.

[17] *Demosthenes* 2.2. Among Plutarch's students were Aristaenetus, Aristodemus, Favorinus, and Taurus. Like Ammonius, Plutarch seems to have forged a mini-Academy in Chaeronea after the decentralization of Plato's Academy in Athens after Antiochus. Cf. Dillon 1977, p. 186, and 1988b, p. 358; Glucker 1978, pp. 257–80; Donini 1986; Opsomer 1998, pp. 21–6.

[18] See Westaway 1922, p. vii: "The popularity of Plutarch as the author of the *Parallel Lives* has never really waned. It is thus surprising that the other half of his extant work, the essays generally called by the collective title of the *Moralia*, should for long periods together be almost unread and unremembered."

[19] Zeller 1868 (in the second half of 3.2 of *Die nacharistotelische Philosophie*), esp. pp. 141, 144–5.

[20] Plutarch is a prominent source in von Arnim's *SVF* collection and in the collection of quotations and testimonia for Academic, Epicurean, and Stoic views in LS. He often provides evidence and quotations of lost tragedies (*Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*), comedies (*Comicorum Attica Fragmenta*), and historical works (*FGrH*).

> Deposed in the last century [the nineteenth century] from his high position as a historian and a moralist, [Plutarch] came to be regarded as little more than a lifeless receptacle, valuable mainly for what he had preserved of earlier literature. His works became a quarry in the scramble for lost sources, his reputation dwindled by comparison with the cloudy trophies of which he was the involuntary savior.[21]

Viewed through the sources that he preserved and as part of an overarching narrative in the development of philosophy, Plutarch was held to be largely unoriginal, derivative in his philosophical views, and an eclectic: "[T]he *Moralia* were, for the most part, taken to consist of either eloquent moralizing diatribes or unoriginal philosophical treatises marred by eclecticism."[22] Plutarch was thought to have disseminated philosophical points in a simplified and more pedestrian form, i.e. as "popular philosophy."[23] His own views were considered a muddled mixture of views that he drew from different schools, without considering their incompatibility. If he could be called a philosopher, he was "second-rate" at best.[24]

In line with this view that Plutarch makes no substantial contribution to philosophy, scholars largely contextualized his own philosophical positions as part of a doxographic tradition, as though Plutarch repeated and slightly altered previous philosophical points from the past. The after-effects of this trend are evident even in Dillon's remarks in *The Middle Platonists*, published in 1977:

---

[21] Jones 1971, p. v.

[22] Kechagia 2011, p. 2. On the history of the concept of eclecticism see the collection of essays in Dillon and Long 1988, esp. Donini 1988 and Dillon 1988a. See also n. 26 below.

[23] Ziegler 1949, pp. 1–2: Ziegler's categorization of a number of Plutarch's works as "Popularphilosophisch-ethische Schriften" took on a life of its own. As Van Hoof 2010 (pp. 2–3 and 6–7) and Van der Stockt 2011 point out, what Ziegler intended by this classification fit with the view that popular philosophy disseminated knowledge to non-elites so that they could make better informed personal judgments without committing themselves to philosophical systems or extensive study. The notion of popular philosophy, however, has been largely associated with "second-rate" moralism "originating in, or percolating to, the lower reaches of…society" (Morgan 2007, p. 2), both since Roman times (cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Second Kingship Oration*, 5–6) and in more modern contexts (cf. Hadot 1995, pp. 61–8, and Sellars 2007, p 140). Cf. Pelling 2011. Note that Dillon continues to describe certain works of Plutarch's as promoting "popular philosophy" as recently as Dillon 2016, pp. 9 and 15.

[24] Centrone 2000, p. 576: Plutarch "is not a thinker of the first rank." Cf. Goldhill 2002, p. 284, and Kechagia 2011, p. 2, for discussion of this view.

> Plutarch was by no means a great original philosopher, but he is an important link in the chain of evidence for the development of Middle Platonism, and he is also, as we shall see, not quite devoid of originality in his doctrines.[25]

Not quite devoid of originality, but close to it, Plutarch was a necessary piece of the puzzle in tracing movements in philosophy, but his own positions were chiefly valuable as stepping stones for later, more creative epochs of philosophy. Even if Dillon denied that Plutarch was an eclectic, Plutarch's philosophy was still second-rate.[26] Dillon even considers "what appears most remarkable at first sight" in Plutarch's philosophy as revelatory more of Middle Platonic thought than Plutarch's own creativity.[27]

Within the Platonic tradition, Plutarch was, as were many of the so-called Middle Platonists of his era, treated as part of dogmatic phase in Platonic philosophy, following the skeptical New Academy and preceding the revolutionary work of Neoplatonism initiated by Plotinus. "Middle" Platonism, much like the construction of the "Middle" Ages in retrospect from the Enlightenment, was viewed as a period of decline, a Dark Ages, if you will, in the history of Platonism. Even outside of the Platonic tradition, the period itself in which Plutarch writes, *ca*. the first century B.C.E. to the second C.E., was long considered "a source of embarrassment to intellectual historians," between the new movements in the Hellenistic period, such as the founding of schools of Stoicism and Epicureanism, and the later revival of Aristotle

---

[25] Dillon 1977, p. 185.

[26] Dillon 1988a, p. 104: "[M]y protest [against this label of eclectic] is only valid if the term be used in a dismissive or pejorative sense, with the implication that the philosophers concerned were too muddleheaded or light-minded to stick to the principles of any of the four main Hellenistic schools." But under what Dillon would consider a less disparaging sense, Plutarch could very well be thought to be eclectic. "If this is eclecticism, it is certainly not mindless eclecticism" (Dillon 1988b, p. 364). Cf. *id*. 1977, pp. xiv–xv. Cf. Babut 1969b, p. 6, for a similar definition of eclecticism as combining elements from different schools "sans discrimination des thèmes empruntés à plusieurs doctrines." See also Becchi 1981.

[27] Dillon 1977, p. 196: "Discussion of Plutarch's philosophy generally centres on those doctrines of his which appear most remarkable at first sight….These characteristics…are liable to be emphasized disproportionately, simply through an inadequate appreciation of the overall framework of Middle Platonism into which they fit."

under Alexander of Aphrodisias alongside Neoplatonic innovation.[28] Plutarch's role in the history of philosophy might be a necessary link in a chain, but it was not thought to be in itself very important or remarkable.

Tides eventually began to turn toward a greater appreciation of Plutarch's philosophy with Konrat Ziegler's *Plutarchos von Chaeroneia* in 1949. Ziegler emphasized Plutarch's creativity in contrast with the scholarship of the preceding century, arguing that the *Lives* present an original approach as part of Plutarch's philosophical program.[29] Plutarch's *Moralia* and philosophical approach also became far better appreciated with Harold Tarrant's work on the philosophical nuances and distinctive positions of Platonists in the so-called Middle Platonic period.[30] In his 1985 monograph, *Scepticism or Platonism?*, Tarrant emphasized the skeptical tendencies of writers, including Plutarch, from what was previously considered the dogmatic low-point in Platonic creative potential. Tarrant's work helped to reinvigorate appreciation of Plutarch and some of his contemporaries, showing that far from stitching quotations and dogmas together from their predecessors, authors like Plutarch were self-consciously engaged in working out their own philosophical positions with some skeptical distancing rather than dogmatic restatement.[31] Tarrant's approach was followed by Jan Opsomer, who focused extensively on these trends in Plutarch's philosophy in his monograph *In Search of the Truth*.[32]

---

[28] Dillon and Long 1988, p. 1. Zeller greatly influenced this view in his Hegelian approach to the history of philosophy, describing the alternation between periods of high and low creativity. Though Dillon and Long 1988 attempt to counter this view, they are nonetheless quite concessive to it and consider Plutarch, among other Middle Platonists, while not exactly "second-rate, dull, and largely derivative," still to be part of a trend in which Platonists relied more on faith in ancient authority and were thus less adventurous in their own views (p. 2).

[29] Ziegler 1949, pp. 273–91. Cf. Theander 1959.

[30] Cf., however, the continued disparagement of writers in this period in Centrone 2000, p. 559: "There is not in fact any single Middle Platonist philosophy, but rather a group of writers who may be described as Platonist by virtue of their allegiance to a nucleus of 'orthodox' positions, contaminated in many instances by Aristotelian and Stoic doctrines, and not the same nucleus in all cases."

[31] On the importance of Tarrant 1985 see Rist 1986; Stough 1987; Sharples 1987; Opsomer 1998, pp. 13–14.

[32] Opsomer 1998.

Plutarch was now considered a proponent of a moderate form of Academic skepticism.[33] He was not dogmatic, as though he merely reiterated teachings passed down through the Platonic tradition. Instead, he was actively engaged in the pursuit of truth through dialectical methods. His view of what it meant to be a Platonist included appreciation not only of the Platonic dialogues, the recorded sayings of Plato and Platonists, and the Platonic tradition carried on by Plato's first followers, but also the works of Aristotle and the skeptical practices of the New Academy.

But this new emphasis on Plutarch's skeptical approach seemed to put some strain on the possibility of *positive* doctrines in Plutarch, even if he generally followed doctrines of Plato and the Academy but was not slavishly repeating them as dogmas. In reaction to the old dogmatic view of Plutarch, the new, more skeptical Plutarch that emerged was one in which positive assumptions of philosophy, especially those that Plutarch seemed to espouse as a follower of Plato, seemed to fit uneasily with his method and manner of attacking Stoic assertations of positive philosophy.[34] How could Plutarch adopt such a skeptical stance and at the same time write works that implicitly or explicitly assume dogmas, or perhaps better, doctrines drawn from Plato's views on the soul, on reality, and on the creation of the world, among others? Plutarch's answer, we will see, lies in his view of the Platonic Academy as a unified tradition centered on the search for truth.

[33] Cf. Babut 1994a and 2007. Cf. also Bonazzi 2012a (pp. 271–3) who provides a concise overview of scholarship on Plutarch's skepticism. Cf. also Dillon 1999, p. 305, who denies that Plutarch was interested in skepticism.
[34] Cf. Boys-Stones 1997b; Opsomer 2005: Opsomer notes that the emphasis on skeptical tendencies in his 1998 monograph was partly due to the thesis of that work, though he does not wish to diminish the extent to which Plutarch also incorporates positive assertions in philosophy and doctrinal elements in the Academy's heritage (pp. 166–200).

§IV The Unity of the Academy

Plutarch self-identifies as part of the Platonic Academy, which, as we will see, he considers to be a *living* tradition that is capable of further development.[35] Plutarch understands the Platonic Academy to be unified, extending in an unbroken line from Socrates and Plato up to his own circle, as suggested by the title of one of his lost works, *On the Unity of the Academy from Plato* (*Περὶ τοῦ μίαν εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος Ἀκαδήμειαν*).[36] Pythagoras stands as an inspiring and almost honorary figure for Plutarch, though it is really Plato who first clearly understands the core tenets that were foreshadowed by Pythagoras.[37] This understanding of the Academy as a unified tradition includes the earliest figures of the Academy as its members, such as Xenocrates and Polemo, whom Plutarch often quotes.[38] It also includes the members of the Skeptical Academy, whose most notorious figures include Arcesilaus and Carneades. Not only is the line from Socrates through the Skeptical Academy unbroken diachronically, like the trunk of a tree, but also includes the seemingly lateral extension by incorporating Aristotle as part of the Platonic tradition.[39] While Plutarch treats later Peripatetics, such as Strato, as deviating too far from some of Plato's central views to count as part of the Academy, he is more favorable toward

[35] Jones 1916 helped to demystify Plutarch's self-identification as a Platonist vis-à-vis his engagement with other schools. Cf. Opsomer 1998, pp. 127–212, esp. pp. 171–8; Brittain 2001, pp. 225–36.
[36] =No. 63 in the Lamprias Catalogue. Plutarch's inclusion of Socrates in this tradition is well attested by *Platonic Questions* 1, *On the Sign of Socrates*, and Plutarch's defense of Socrates in *Reply to Colotes*, which are discussed below. On Plutarch's mini-Academy see n. 17 above.
[37] See, for instance, Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 441E1–442A5=[T45] in Chapter 2. See also the discussion of Pythagoras and Plutarch's view of the Pythagorean tradition in Chapter 2, §VII, with the accompanying notes. Cf. Karamanolis 2006, p. 104, n. 60.
[38] For quotations and references to Xenocrates see *On Listening to Lectures* 38B, 47E; *On Isis and Osiris* 360D, 361B; *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 416C–D, 417B–C, 417E, 419A; *On Moral Virtue* 446E, 452D; *On Being a Busybody* 521A; *On Fate* 568E; *On the Sign of Socrates* 591B; *Table-Talk* 706C, 733A, 745B–C; *On the Face in the Moon* 943E–F, 945C; *On the Eating of Flesh* 1, 996A; *Platonic Questions* 8, 1007C and 9, 1007F; *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1012D, 1013A–B; *On Common Notions* 1065A, 1069A, 1069E, *Reply to Colotes* 1111D, 1124E; and Sandbach frr. 57 and 99. For quotations and references to Polemo see *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780D; *Alcibiades* 4.3–4; and *Theseus and Romulus* 1.6.
[39] See Babut 2007.

Aristotle, who, by Plutarch's estimation, is generally still a faithful member to Plato's philosophy and core tenets.[40]

This view of the Academy may seem odd to modern interpreters, since the different figures that Plutarch sees as part of this tradition come to many different conclusions, or espouse none at all.[41] Even among the ancients, these differences were felt to be significant enough to count not only as different sects or phases within the Platonic tradition, as Antiochus of Ascalon divides the phases of the Academy between Old and New,[42] but also, in the case of Aristotle and his followers, as a break off into a different school of philosophy.[43] As George Karamanolis has shown, Plutarch's inclusion of Aristotle within this tradition is not based on his ignorance of Aristotle's works: Plutarch had access to Aristotle's exoteric and esoteric works and shows great

[40] Plutarch, *Reply to Colotes* 1115B–C. Cf. Karamanolis 2006, pp. 85–126: "The crucial matter…is that, according to Plutarch, Strato came to contradict Plato extensively because he departed from Aristotle's own doctrines. Plutarch's implication apparently is that Aristotle is closer to Plato in many of the issues in which and later Peripatetics diverge strongly from Plato" (p. 97). I discuss these points further below and in Chapter 2, §VII.
[41] Arcesilaus wrote nothing of his own (*On the Great Fortune or Virtue of Alexander* 1, 328A). For the representation of Arcesilaus' skepticism as pervasive, assuming that truth itself is unattainable, see Cicero, *On Ends* 2.2, *On the Nature of the Gods* 1.11, *On Fate* 4, *Academica* 1.16. Plutarch does not share this view of Arcesilaus' philosophy. See *Reply to Colotes* 1120C–1122A.
[42] Cf. Cicero, *Academica* 1.13, 1.46, 2.15, 2.70, and 2.136.
[43] Cf. Babut 2007.

knowledge of them.[44] Nor is Plutarch unaware of Aristotle's differences and rejection of certain Platonic arguments, which Plutarch sometimes notes.[45]

Plutarch, however, thinks that this tradition follows from what we might today consider a synthesis of Socratic aporetic and Platonic positive approaches to philosophy. The roots, as it were, of the Platonic Academy for Plutarch contain the potential for a variety of different argumentative approaches and, as Plutarch sees it, seminally contain many of the routes that are explored within the tradition. Take, for example, Plutarch's understanding of Socrates and the inception of the Platonic Academy. Socrates begins a search for truth (ζήτησις) that requires distancing oneself from one's own arguments and proposals so that beliefs can be examined and rejected if contrary evidence requires.[46] Plutarch takes the midwifery metaphors of the *Theaetetus*[47] quite seriously (*Platonic Questions* 1): Socrates' refutation of arguments is a form of therapy that helps others to abandon unfounded and contradictory beliefs as well as excessive

[44] Karamanolis 2006, pp. 85–126, esp. 89–92, and Becchi 2014, pp. 73–4. Donini 1974 (pp. 66–8) and Sandbach 1982 (p. 210–19) argue that Plutarch used a "standard view" of Aristotle, i.e. a later Peripatetic summary, in his discussions of the *Topics*, *Nicomachean Ethics*, and other Aristotelian works (cf. Becchi 1990, pp. 27–9, who provides a summary of different views on the topic through 1990). Karamanolis 2006 (pp. 89–121, esp. pp. 89–92), however, argues that Plutarch had access to more of Aristotle's works than we do today: Plutarch often mentions having Aristotle's works "at hand" (πρόχειρα, *Table-Talk* 616D3–5), he draws conclusions "that are clear from what he [Aristotle] wrote" (ὡς δῆλόν ἐστιν ἐξ ὧν ἔγραψεν, *On Moral Virtue* 442B3), he criticizes others for not looking at what Aristotle himself wrote in *On the Heavens* and *On the Soul* (*Reply to Colotes* 1115A; cf. Babut 1996, pp. 10–16), and provides insight into Aristotle's arguments in both the esoteric and exoteric works, acknowledging this division among Aristotle's works (*Reply to Colotes* 1115B–C, *Alexander* 7.1–8) and mentioning what appear to be Aristotle's dialogues, his "Platonic works" (ἐν τοῖς Πλατωνικοῖς, *Reply to Colotes* 1118C). Plutarch, in fact, provides some of the best evidence that we have for Aristotle's lost dialogues, mentioning *On Nobility* (fr. 3 Ross), *Eudemus* (frr. 1, 6, 9 Ross), *On Philosophy* (test. 1, fr. 6 Ross), *Symposium* (frr. 3, 11, 12 Ross), *On Wealth* (fr. 1 Ross), *Erotikos* (frr. 2–3 Ross), *On Justice* (fr. 4 Ross). Karamanolis concludes that "Plutarch's familiarity with Aristotle's work must be beyond a doubt" (p. 92). For a useful discussion on the survival and availability of Aristotle's works in Plutarch's time see Janko 2011, pp. 390–8. Cf. also Betegh 2010. On the influence of Aristotelian ethics in Plutarch's time see also Inwood 2014, pp. 73–104, esp. pp. 103–4.

[45] Plutarch writes, for instance, that Aristotle rejected the Theory of Forms in both his esoteric and exoteric works and notes that Aristotle departed from Plato's view on the composition of the world (*Reply to Colotes* 1114F–1115C). Cf. Karamanolis 2006, pp. 85–126, esp. pp. 88, 92–100. I discuss these points further in Chapter 2, §VII and the accompanying notes.

[46] On the classification of Plato's dialogues, among which some are thought to be ζητητικοί, see D.L. 3.49. Cf. Opsomer 1998, pp. 12 and 27–33.

[47] 150c7–151d3, 157c9–d2, 161e4–6, 184a8–b2, 210b8–9.

love of themselves and their own opinions (φιλαυτία).[48] This distancing and suspension of commitment to conclusions extends also to doctrines passed down from others. As we will see in the chapters that follow, Plutarch feels free to disagree with key figures from the Old Academy explicitly. He also at times goes against the grain of the dominant arguments in Plato's dialogues, as we will see in Chapter 2 with the case of grief.[49]

Plutarch would deny that the more skeptical and aporetic approach exemplified in Socrates and the more positive development of philosophical views found in works like the *Timaeus* and *Republic* could be easily sifted out and pulled apart. As Mark Shiffman has argued, Plutarch's representation of Socrates in *Platonic Questions* 1, in fact, unites both the more skeptical and doctrinal approaches: drawing on Plato's *Symposium*, Plutarch describes Socrates as the exemplar of a philosophical approach that is erotic at heart, desirous of truth, but not yet in full possession of it.[50] Plutarch does not hold the view that Socrates believes truth to be unattainable.[51] He even sees figures like Arcesilaus and Carneades as following Socrates' example and likewise performing a service to others, purging them of false beliefs. Arcesilaus and Carneades, following in Socrates' footsteps, aid their interlocutors in their search for truth by removing their poorly founded beliefs, promoting the suspension of judgement to avoid hasty or

---

[48] Cf. Opsomer 1998, pp. 150–61. Plutarch considers φιλαυτία a vice. See *How to Tell a Friend from Flatterer* 48E–49B, 65E–66A; *On Listening to Lectures* 40F; *Theseus and Romulus* 2.2; *Dion* 46.2. Cf. also Ingenkamp 1971, pp. 131–2; Van der Stockt 1999 (esp. p. 594, n. 46); and Roskam 2004b, pp. 251–2 and n. 22.

[49] Although I do not discuss the topic at length in my dissertation, Plutarch also implicitly disagrees with the criticisms of poetry in Plato's *Republic* 2, 3, and 10, in *How a Young Man Should Read Poetry*. See Chapter 2, n. 124 and Chapter 5, §IV. Cf. also Neumayr 1963 and 1964; Zadorojnyi 2002; and Blank 2011.

[50] Shiffman 2010. On p. 271, Shiffman writes, "it is clear as well that the Platonic Socrates serves Plutarch as a fundamental fixed point of reference, a standard for the integrity of the practice of philosophy. One crucial measure of the integrity of that practice, it appears, is its ability to attain and maintain self-knowledge in the mode of erotic wisdom. This integrity demands the cathartic practices of elenchus, aporia, and ephexis; and while these tools from the skeptic's kit do turn out to be instrumental, it is not to a partisan doctrinal piety. Rather, they are in the service of a zetetic and, ultimately, erotic understanding of Socratic skepticism."

[51] See *Platonic Questions* 1, 1000C–D; *Reply to Colotes* 1122A–1124B; *On the Principle of Cold* 955C. Cf. Boys-Stones 1997a, 1997b; Opsomer 1998, pp. 78–212; Brittain 2001, pp. 225–36; Karamanolis 2006, pp. 85–7 and n. 10; Bonazzi 2014.

over-confident conviction.[52] Their therapeutic cross-examination and refutation of interlocutors serves as a preliminary purgation before entering into further serious investigation.

The titles of several of Plutarch's lost works in the Lamprias Catalogue attest to Plutarch's view of the unifying nature of this approach, which incorporates both a skeptical element with the acceptance of doctrines that are the best available views on a given topic, which Plutarch usually thinks were developed by Plato himself. I believe that Opsomer is correct to see the proximity of *On the Difference between the Pyrrhonians and Academics*[53] to *On the Unity of the Academy from Plato* as highly suggestive that Plutarch viewed the skeptical Academics as holding to key doctrines, even if they were willing, perhaps more than others in the Platonic tradition, to treat all views dialectically and with a suspension of judgment.[54] This suggestion is corroborated in Plutarch's defense of Arcesilaus in *Reply to Colotes* (1120C–1122), where Plutarch praises Colotes, tongue-in-cheek, for correctly situating Arcesilaus as a recipient of an ancient Academic tradition, following the example of Socrates who helped purge others of false beliefs (1122A).[55]

In line with this understanding of the Academy, Plutarch incorporates a skeptical side to his philosophical approach as a corrective to the formation of and attachment to false beliefs, since this aspect of his approach checks over-confidence and unwarranted attachment to certain positions. Plutarch writes that one's theory, no matter its provenance, must fit reality (τὰ δόγματα πρὸς τοῖς πράγμασιν); since we cannot force reality to fit our theories because of a

[52] *On the Great Fortune or Virtue of Alexander* 1, 328A–B. See also D.L. 1.16, 4.32; Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods* 1.11, *Tusculan Disputations* 5.11.
[53] *Περὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς τῶν Πυρρωνείων καὶ Ἀκαδημαϊκῶν*, no. 64 in the Lamprias Catalogue.
[54] Opsomer 1998, p. 173. Cf. also Thorsrud 2010, p. 62.
[55] Cf. Cicero, *Academica* 1.45–6, who also sees the New Academy's practices as part of the tradition that goes back to Plato.

tradition (*On Moral Progress* 75F4–9), not even a Platonic tradition.[56] Plato may have provided the best arguments in psychology, epistemology, and metaphysics, but his views are still subject to evaluation, criticism, and further exploration. In natural philosophy Aristotle often provides the best set of views available, which Plutarch takes to be in line with Plato's own philosophical approach.[57] The Platonic tradition has developed some of the best views, Plutarch believes, but still enjoins its members to continue to work them out.

§V Core Doctrines and Tenets

In conjunction with the more skeptical aspect of his philosophical approach, Plutarch holds certain Platonic teachings to be central features of Platonism. These doctrines are the best explanations of certain phenomena that have already withstood a great deal of critical examination. Certain core philosophical positions, which we commonly associate with both Plato's dialogues and Platonists, resurface again and again in Plutarch's works, defended and taken as starting-points for further philosophical exploration.[58] I take it that these are doctrines that Plutarch himself holds to, though he is comfortable putting his own twist on how we are to understand them. One of the core tenets that Plutarch explicitly advocates and defends against rival philosophical schools, whose conclusions and methods Plutarch finds unconvincing, is that the embodied state of the human soul consists in both rational and non-rational parts.

[56] "But correctly has it been said, 'Place the stone straight with the measuring line, not the measuring line with the stone.' But those who do not align their teachings with the facts but instead try to force the facts unnaturally to agree with their own assumptions have filled philosophy with many puzzles" (ἀλλ' ὀρθῶς μὲν εἴρηται τὸ "πρὸς στάθμῃ πέτρον τίθεσθαι, μή τι πρὸς πέτρῳ στάθμην.' οἱ δὲ μὴ τιθέμενοι τὰ δόγματα πρὸς τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀλλὰ τὰ πράγματα πρὸς τὰς ἑαυτῶν ὑποθέσεις ὁμολογεῖν μὴ πεφυκότα καταβιαζόμενοι πολλῶν ἀποριῶν ἐμπεπλήκασι τὴν φιλοσοφίαν). I discuss this passage in Chapter 2, §VII.
[57] See Teodorsson 1999. Cf. Karamanolis 2006, pp. 85–121, esp. pp. 86–9.
[58] Cf. Karamanolis 2006, p. 85.

§V.a. Platonic Psychology: Bipartition and Tripartition

Plutarch describes the embodied soul as a mixture of both rational and non-rational parts, whose distinction from one another is most evident in cases of psychic conflict, as when one's non-rational desires oppose one's rational judgments. In Chapter 1, I explore Plutarch's use of the *locus classicus* of critical psychic conflict in *Republic* 4. While this distinction between the rational and non-rational parts of the soul is manifest in cases of internal struggle, Plutarch holds that the division persists in cases of psychic concord, when all desires both rational and non-rational are harmonious.[59]

The division of the soul between a rational part and non-rational part is the first, basic division that Plutarch uses throughout his moral works on the soul. While some take Plutarch's frequent use of this basic division as an indication that his psychology is essentially bipartite, arguing that Plutarch favors Aristotle's own division of a soul divided between reason and non-rational passions, Plutarch is nevertheless explicit that the non-rational part of the soul is subject to further subdivision into the spirited and appetitive parts, as we find them described in Plato's *Republic*, *Phaedrus*, and *Timaeus*. Despite this further explication, many scholars have argued that Plutarch pays mere lip-service to Platonic tripartite psychology, perhaps in order to give greater clout to his claims of Platonic adherence, but his psychology is nonetheless bipartite in its main and important features and is essentially Aristotelian.[60]

---

[59] *On Moral Virtue* 448D1–3.

[60] Westaway 1922, p. 41: "The latter [the non-rational, affective part] can again be subdivided into the concupiscible (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν) and the spirited (τὸ θυμοειδές); but this subdivision was rejected by Aristotle and is not important." In Westaway's view, the subdivision of the non-rational passionate part of the soul is not important *for Plutarch* as well as for Aristotle. Opsomer 2012 (pp. 316–24 and n. 68) argues that Plutarch's overall commitment is to a bipartite soul of reason and non-rational passions, though he sometimes discusses the spirited element as separate, but he argues that tripartition should not be seriously considered, since Plutarch holds that the human soul is isomorphic with the world-soul, which is bipartite. On p. 319, Opsomer writes, "There can be no doubt that Plutarch regards the bipartition as fundamental; but of course, when a Platonist expressly discusses soul-division he has to take into account what Plato says about the *three* parts of the soul." Cf. also Vander Waerdt 1985b, pp. 284–6; Opsomer 1994, pp. 33–6; 1998, pp. 33–6; 2006, p. 213; Beneker 2012, pp. 12–17.

My own view is that we should take Plutarch at his word when he describes the soul as truly tripartite. This is not in conflict with his tendency to treat the soul as bipartite, since he often finds it sufficient to treat the soul according to the most distinctive and major division of a rational part and its separation from the non-rational. In doing so, he does not abandon Platonic psychology, but actually follows the Platonic precedent we find in *Republic* 10, where Socrates, after establishing the division of the soul into three parts in preceding books, nonetheless treats the soul as bipartite in the arguments of *Republic* 10.[61]

As I show in Chapters 4 and 5, the further subdivision of the non-rational part of the soul into the spirited and appetitive parts is crucial to Plutarch's theory of moral formation. Plutarch carves out an important and necessary role for spirited emotions such as shame, the desire for honor, and ambition that help set the young on the path to virtue and help to draw them in pursuit of the virtuous life. If we assume that Plutarch holds the division between spirited and appetitive passions to be of no real significance because he does not always explicitly mark a distinction between them, we miss the important role that Plutarch assigns to the spirited passions and the spirited part of the soul.

§V.b. Moderation or Eradication of Emotions?

Another significant point in Plutarch's moral psychology vis-à-vis his Platonic heritage is the question of whether the passions should be moderated (μετριοπάθεια) in the moral life or eradicated altogether (ἀπάθεια). The question is more complex than it may first appear. One's position is framed by how we understand the notions of (i) what a passion is, (ii) how passions arise in the soul, (iii) whether passions can be completely eliminated or merely suppressed, and

[61] Cf. Karamanolis 2006, pp. 115–23. Cf. also Opsomer 2007a, p. 154, n. 15.

(iv) whether passions should be present or absent in the embodied life and in a possible after-life. Some have thought, for instance, that advocates of the elimination of passions (ἀπάθεια) really mean the *suppression* of immoderate passions (in answer to (iii)), which could bring their view much closer in line with whose who advocate the moderation of passions (μετριοπάθεια). If that is the case, some argue, then the dispute might merely be *verbal* rather than substantive.[62]

I agree with Sorabji that the disagreement can be substantive.[63] While particular individuals may blur the lines between major camps, Chrysippus presents the strongest position of ἀπάθεια that became the main line position of the Stoic school up through Epictetus' time.[64] Chrysippus' arguments for ἀπάθεια are decidedly in conflict with the view that passions can be both useful and good. In Chrysippus' camp, in answer to (i) and (ii) above, passions are irrational and errors of belief and judgment; they are diseased states of an essentially rational soul. How can one have a good amount of disease or a moderate amount of irrationality and not consider it still bad?[65] In answer to (iii), passions can be entirely eliminated by perfecting one's rationality; they are not suppressed but replaced by correct reasoning. In answer to (iv), passions have no place in the best life on earth. Plutarch disagrees with the Stoics on nearly every point in (i)–(iv), as we will see in Chapter 1.[66]

---

[62] Sandbach 1975, pp. 63–4; Dillon 1983; Annas 1992, pp. 103 and 114.
[63] Cf. Sorabji 2000, pp. 181–210, esp. 206–210. On the traditions of moderating or eradication passions see also Lilla 1971, pp. 99–106; Ferrari 2008, pp. 135–8.
[64] Cf. Sorabji 2000, pp. 183–4 and 195–6.
[65] Cf. Seneca, *Letters* 85.3–5, 116.1; cf. Irwin 1998, pp. 223–4; Sorabji 2000, pp. 207–9.
[66] On Plutarch's relationship to the Stoics see Babut 1969b and his collection of essays in Babut 1994. Cf. also Opsomer 2014.

§V.c. Moderation and Eradication of Passions from Plato through Porphyry

Plato's dialogues are somewhat ambiguous in the evaluation and proposed treatment of the passions, as will be explored in Chapter 2.[67] In the *Phaedo*, for instance, passions seem to be evils of embodiment.[68] In the *Timaeus*, passions appear to arise from the non-rational parts of the soul, which are added to the rational part of the soul as necessary evils of embodiment. In *Republic* 10, the truest nature of the soul is described as purely rational, and the passions and the passionate parts of the soul appear to be accretions, once again, due to embodiment. Passions are presented as non-ideal and are often described as pollutions of our better, rational nature that hinder and distract us in our pursuit of the best life. The extent to which passions serve useful or necessary purposes is unclear. Passions such as grief are to be suppressed as far as is possible.[69] On this point, Plutarch emphatically disagrees, as we will see in Chapter 2. In Plato's *Phaedrus* and *Symposium*, however, passions such as ἔρως seem to play important roles in drawing one to the Good itself. They also seem to motivate moral agents in good actions.[70]

Out of this ambiguity, the early members of the Platonic Academy of Aristotle's time seem to have taken the view that passions should be eliminated (ἀπάθεια). Aristotle, in the *Eudemian Ethics*, writes that this view is ubiquitous within Plato's Academy, and he seems to target Speusippus, the first head of the Academy after Plato, as an advocate for this position.[71]

---

[67] Cf. Dillon 1983, pp. 508–10; Sorabji 2000, p. 201.
[68] Sorabji 2000, p. 201, interestingly sees the issue as complicated by the fact that the rational part of the soul can experience pleasure due to intellectual activity (*Phaedo* 114e). Sorabji does not here distinguish rational pleasures and desires from non-rational passions.
[69] *Republic* 10, 606a–b.
[70] The definition of justice in *Republic* 4 may also indicate that each part of the soul, like each part of the city, contributes to the whole, doing its own part (432e4–436b4).
[71] *Eudemian Ethics* 2.4, 1222a2–5; *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.3, 1104b24–8; 7.13, 1153b1–7; 10.2, 1173a6–13; cf. Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights* 9.5.4; Clement, *Miscellanies* 2.22. Cf. Sorabji 2000, pp. 194–5 and nn. 4–6. Cf. Burnet 1900, pp. 84–5, who in his commentary on 1104b24–6 identifies Plato's Academy as Aristotle's target. Note also the definition of ἀπάθεια in the pseudo-Platonic *Definitions* 413a5: "Passionlessness: the state according to which we are not liable to fall into passions" (ἀπάθεια ἕξις καθ' ἣν ἀνέμπτωτοί ἐσμεν εἰς πάθη). So defined, the absence of passions seems to be a good thing, since it protects us from "falling into" passionate states.

Though we do not know what Plato's own view on the subject might have been, nor do we have access to his views presented in conversation with his followers, one can see how the members of the early Academy might read into Plato's dialogues the goal of ἀπάθεια, given the frequent presentation of passions as non-ideal. Plutarch, as we will see in Chapter 2, does not share this negative evaluation of emotions.

Against figures such as Speusippus, Aristotle seems to be the first major champion for the moderation of passions.[72] Aristotle's doctrine of the mean (μεσότης) assumes that passions can be useful and are necessary components of moral virtue. Passions must be moderated and directed to appropriate ends, at the right time, in the right degree, under appropriate conditions, etc., but they do admit of correct proportions. We can err not only in having excessive passions, but also in being deficient in passions.[73] This does not indicate that *all* passions alike have mean states, since there are bad emotions that do not have any appropriate place in the moral life, such as envy and taking delight in others' misfortunes.[74]

After Aristotle, most adherents of both Platonic and Peripatetic philosophy favor μετριοπάθεια over ἀπάθεια in their understanding of moral virtue.[75] This holds true for figures of the Old Academy, such as Crantor, who, like Plutarch, goes against the grain of Plato's *Republic* by defending the naturalness of grief.[76] It also holds true for Plutarch's near

[72] See the citations to Aristotle, Aulus Gellius, and Clement in the previous note. For this view of Aristotle among later philosophers cf. also D.L. 5.31; Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.22, 4.38; Arius Didymus, quoted in Stob. 2.7.13.
[73] *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.5–7; *Eudemian Ethics* 2.3, 2.5, 2.10. Cf. Sorabji 2000, pp. 194–5.
[74] *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.6, 1107a8–15.
[75] Cicero, *Academica* 1.19, 38–9; 2.131, 135–36; Stob. 2.7.20. Cf. Sorabji 2000, p. 196; Lilla 1971, pp. 99–106.
[76] Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.12, 70–1; *Academica* 2.44, 135; cf. Plutarch, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102D, discussed in Chapter 2.

contemporaries within the Platonic tradition, such as Alcinous, Taurus, Maximus of Tyre, and Apuleius.[77]

The controversy, however, is still more complicated. I mentioned above that one's view of what should be done with the passions involves the question of (iv) whether the passions should be part of the embodied life and a possible after-life. That passions must be moderated certainly holds for the embodied, active life in Aristotle. Moderation of passions also seems to be necessary as part of embodiment in Plato's dialogues. Some even take certain passages in the *Republic* as foreshadowing the doctrine of the mean as it is found in Aristotle's works.[78] The fact that Plato's immediate followers overwhelmingly supported the goal of ἀπάθεια, however, casts doubt on how well this formulation in the *Republic* was understood as advocating μετριοπάθεια.[79] But, even if Plato, Aristotle, and their immediate followers considered moderation of passions part of the story of how one achieves *moral* virtue in this life, Plato and Aristotle also speak of another ideal of pure contemplation that is free from the passions, which might be possible during the embodied life, or at least worth pursuing during the embodied life.[80]

The Neoplatonists Plotinus and Porphyry, writing some time after Plutarch, see μετριοπάθεια as preparatory for a higher kind of life. Moderation only applies to the civic virtues, or moral virtues of the embodied life, while the virtue of pure intellect is free of all

[77] Alcinous, *Handbook* 184.24 and 28; Taurus (reported by Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights* 1.26.5–11=Boys-Stones 18W in Boys-Stones 2017); Maximus of Tyre, *Orations* 27.7; Apuleius, *On the Doctrines of Plato* 2.20.247.
[78] *Republic* 4, 423e5–6, 431c5–7; 10, 619a5–6. Cf. Gronau 1914, p. 254; Lilla 1971, p. 99 and n. 4. I discuss these passages in Chapter 2.
[79] Dillon 1983, pp. 508–9, also believes that Plato, *Statesman* 284e outlines a nearly Aristotelian view of moderating passions as well as *Laws* 1, 631b.
[80] Plato, *Phaedo* 82d; *Republic* 10, 611b–612a; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 10.8, 1178b8–23; *Protrepticus* fr. 12 Ross. Cf. Sorabji 2000, pp. 187–9.

passions.[81] Modern interpreters have often found it tempting to read these divisions and separate ideals back into Plato and Aristotle,[82] as well as Plutarch.[83]

§V.d. Plutarch and μετριοπάθεια

Where does Plutarch place himself in this controversy? Some have argued that Plutarch wavers between the two ideals.[84] Others see Plutarch as either reiterating or appropriating Aristotle's doctrine of the mean in his view that passions should be moderated rather than eradicated.[85] As we will see in Chapter 2, Plutarch draws upon both Plato's dialogues and Aristotle's moral philosophy to explicate his own view of moral virtues as mean states of the passions that are part of the harmony of the soul. Concerning the two ideals of moral virtue and intellectual virtue, Plutarch uses the division of intellectual and moral virtues to establish a passionless ideal for the theoretical activity of contemplation while maintaining that the practical life of moral virtues requires the moderation of passions.[86] Contemplation does not require or benefit from the presence or interference of passions, while practical action and moral virtue require the presence and activities of the passions.

We might still wonder what Plutarch makes of these two ideals. Is the goal of moral virtue subordinated to a higher goal of passionless intellection, as we find in Plotinus and Porphyry? Aristotle and Plato both seem to praise the pleasure and freedom of the purely contemplative life over the distractions and struggles of embodied moral virtue. Given this

[81] Plotinus, *Enneads* 1.2.2.14–18, 1.2.3.20, 1.2.6.25–7; Porphyry, *Sentences* 32.6–8, 29–32, 71–8, 131–6. Cf. also Clement, *Miscellanies* 6.9.74.
[82] Cf. Annas 1999, pp. 66–71; Sedley 1997 and 1999, pp. 316–28.
[83] Cf. Karamanolis 2014 ("6. Ethics and Politics"). I discuss this point further in Chapter 6.
[84] Nikolaidis 1991, pp. 169–71; Spanneut 1994, pp. 4704–11; Sorabji 2000, p. 196; Machek 2018, pp. 256–7. Cf. Becchi 1999, who convincingly argues that once we correctly interpret Plutarch, we see that he does not advocate *elimination* of passions *per se*, but elimination of *excessive* passion. I address this issue further in Chapters 2 and 3.
[85] Pinnoy 1973; Donini 1974, 1986; Dillon 1983. Cf. Opsomer 2012, pp. 15–17.
[86] Cf. Babut 1969b, pp. 321–33; Cf. Gill 2006, pp. 237–8. I discuss these points further in Chapters 3 and 6.

background, Plutarch takes a surprisingly different approach, which I explore in Chapter 6. Plutarch argues that the ideal of contemplation must not distract us from the active life. As the quotation at the beginning of the introduction stresses, the highest ideal of becoming like god does not mean abandoning the practical life of moral virtues and human social life, but instead invigorates it. We may attain a passionless state of contemplation after death, but in this life, becoming like god aims at perfecting and realizing one's full embodied human nature as a human agent seeking to benefit others and, like Plato's Demiurge (*Timaeus* 29a3), make this world the best that it can be.[87]

§VI Outline of Chapters

In the first chapter, I begin with Plutarch's criticisms of the Stoic ideal of invulnerability. The passionless ideal (ἀπάθεια), intended to render one unassailable and unaffected by the vicissitudes of fortune, comes at the cost of genuine concern for others. Plutarch argues that the Stoic ideal of the passionless life amounts to calloused insensitivity; it requires the mutilation of our own nature, not its fulfillment. Although the Stoics argue that the passionless ideal is the natural end of human nature, as described in their theory of moral development of "appropriation," or "identification" (οἰκείωσις), Plutarch argues that the Stoic theory ironically leads to *alienation* from our own nature, the good of friendship, and from our friends themselves.

In Chapter 2, I argue that Plutarch's criticisms of the Stoic goal of invulnerability appear to bring Plutarch into conflict with Plato's dialogues. Contrary to the *Republic*'s argument that grief should be eradicated as far as possible, Plutarch argues that passions in general, and grief specifically, are natural and serve useful purposes. Plutarch's more positive evaluation of

[87] Cf. Bonazzi 2012a, esp. pp. 150–1.

passions as integral to moral virtue also seems in conflict with the negative evaluation of passions and the ideal life of a passionless, rational soul that we find in several passages of Plato's dialogues. Plutarch's affirmation of the passionate, embodied human condition and his definition of moral virtue as the moderation of passions (μετριοπάθεια), additionally appears far more Aristotelian than Platonic. Is Plutarch pitting Aristotle against Plato? I will argue that Plutarch would not see it that way. He emphasizes the positive descriptions of the passions in Plato's dialogues and takes Aristotle's treatment of the passions to be part of an authentic, unified Platonic tradition and development of Platonic moral philosophy.

In Chapter 3, we will explore Plutarch's argument for the positive incitement to virtue that passions can provide. For Plutarch, passions serve a necessary role in the embodied life. Without passions, we would not be able to act, since passions provide impulses that are necessary for action. As part of his more positive evaluation of the passions, Plutarch also describes the passions as added to our nature by the gods for our benefit. Beyond being necessary, passions also can incite virtue and amplify virtuous action. Anger, enthusiasm, and the love of honor, can all ignite and intensify one's pursuit of the virtuous life.

Chapter 4 explores the cognitive aspect of spirited emotions in contrast with appetitive passions. Spirited emotions are more complex than appetites and can serve a role in evaluating desires and actions in terms of whether they should be viewed as honorable or shameful. These greater cognitive features allow for spirited passions to play an important role in the regulation of our own desires and actions. If we train our spirited emotions well, they help to set us on the path to virtue and keep us from straying from it.

In Chapter 5, we turn to the topic of early education. Plutarch argues that training children to take pleasure in what is honorable and feel pain toward what is shameful is the most

important aspect of early education that prepares the soul for moral virtue. In his argument on this point, Plutarch contrasts his own position with that of Xenocrates, who considered education in the sciences, such as geometry, astronomy, and music, to be the most important preparatory education for moral progress. Habituation of passions, Plutarch argues, is more fundamental and more important in setting the young on the path to virtue and in keeping their progress steady on that path. Plutarch's position looks quite similar to Aristotle's, since Aristotle also argues that a soul that has been habituated to take pleasure and feel pain in the right ways is like a soil that has been prepared for further moral education. Once again, however, Plutarch is not simply pitting Aristotle against Plato: both Plutarch and Aristotle draw upon Plato's *Republic* and *Laws* to emphasize the habituation of passions as preparation for moral progress.

In Chapter 6, I begin with Plutarch's use of the metaphor of plant cultivation. While bad desires and passions may sprout up within the soul like weeds, Plutarch argues that there are good passions that must be developed and promoted like fruitful crops in a garden. Unlike his predecessors and contemporaries, Plutarch focuses on the passions as the seeds of virtue, not rational principles or discourse. Plutarch also indicates through this metaphor that passions, like plants, provide a principle of growth and an internal trajectory towards virtue as their fruit. We must tend to our passions so that they develop correctly, but it is through their cultivation, not their suppression, that we bring about moral virtue.

This brings us to Plutarch's inclusion of affection for offspring as a passion which, among others, grows toward virtue. Plutarch draws on the image of an outward expanding concern for others that is described in the Stoic theory of "appropriation" or "identification" (οἰκείωσις), but alters its starting-point. Plutarch plants the seed of justice within our passionate nature. We learn to identify with others' concerns through this passion. This passion alone is not

sufficient to bring about the virtue of justice in the soul, but nonetheless initiates the movement of expanding our concern to others outside of ourselves.

As one progresses in moral virtue, particularly the virtue of justice, Plutarch describes the end-goal and fulfillment of human nature as the imitation of god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ). For Plutarch, becoming like god does not require the removal or absence of passions altogether. We are to become like god with the whole of our embodied human nature which includes our passions. Those who become like god in this life emulate the divine ruler and craftsman of Plato's *Timaeus*. They do so by developing other-regarding passions, such as benevolence, so that they act as beneficent moral agents who seek the good of others within their own spheres of influence.

CHAPTER 1

Emotional Vulnerability and Friendship

For Plutarch, passions are central to human life. Not only are they essential components of human nature, but they also establish the foundations of human intimacy, aid in moral progress, and enrich human experience. This makes Plutarch's philosophy and the kind of life it promotes both attractive and distinct. In the chapters that follow, we will explore many of Plutarch's arguments and metaphors that emphasize the positive roles that passions play in human life, contrasting Plutarch's positive view of emotions with his rivals and, to some extent, his predecessors. In this chapter, we will begin with Plutarch's arguments for the centrality of passions in human friendships and his argument that passions are an ineliminable aspect of human nature that we would not choose to be without even if we could.

To draw out Plutarch's distinctive, positive evaluation of passions, I think it best to start with his attack on the dominant philosophical rival of his time, the Stoics, who are the strongest proponents of ἀπάθεια, i.e. that passions should be eliminated from our nature.[1] Plutarch targets the goal of invulnerability in his attack on Stoic ethics and psychology. The Stoic sage, who

[1] Plutarch is chiefly concerned with the doctrines that emerge from the Old Stoa, especially Chrysippus in his arguments against the eradication of emotion (ἀπάθεια) and the invulnerability of the sage. While views might vary among some later Stoics, which Plutarch shows awareness of in *On Moral Virtue* 440E–441B and *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1034C–E, 1046E–1047A, 1047E–1048C, Chrysippus "established the main Stoic view on this question" (Sorabji 2000, pp. 206–7), which even as late as Epictetus shows dominance in the Stoic view of humanity and the need to eradicate emotions (pp. 181–4; cf. pp. 195–6 and 208–10). Cf. Hershbell 1992, p. 3346. On Plutarch's relationship with the Stoics see Babut 1969a, 1969b, and his collection of essays in Babut 1994, Ingenkamp 1999, Castelnérac 2007, and Opsomer 2014. See also §V.b of the Introduction.

exemplifies perfected rationality and the fulfillment of human nature for the Stoics, is fully virtuous, fully happy, and his happiness is invulnerable to circumstances outside his control. Virtue, the Stoics claim, is sufficient for happiness and is entirely within our power. It is supremely valuable and the only good (§I). The Stoic goal of invulnerability is incompatible with human passion. Passions by their nature make us vulnerable, since they lead us to value things that are outside our control. If we value a friendship we have, for instance, and our friend dies a premature and painful death, we feel pain and grief at the loss. Since passions make us vulnerable, the Stoics argue that they must be eliminated. The sage does not form vulnerable relationships and is not affected by the plight of his friends (§II).

Plutarch argues that this view of human nature and friendship is not natural and based on a faulty understanding of human psychology. Stoic psychology fails to account for common experiences of psychic conflict and misunderstands the nature of passions as non-rational. Passions are not diseased states but are essential components of human nature (§III). Even beyond this, Plutarch argues that if we could entirely rid ourselves of passions and become invulnerable to what is outside our control, we *should* not. It would come at too high a cost to our ability to form genuine and intimate relationships with others, which are only possible when we are vulnerable in our care and concern for others (§IV). Friendship is a great good for Plutarch. It is worth the cost of our vulnerability and is our best source of comfort in the face of adversity and grief (§V).

Plutarch thus reveals that there is something deeply flawed with the Stoics' understanding of human nature and the passions. The Stoic foundational theory of human development, Stoic "appropriation" / "identification" (οἰκείωσις) is flawed, since it leads to a false ideal of human fulfillment that is uninterested in the condition or plight of others. Stoic οἰκείωσις ironically

leads to one's alienation from one's friends and the passionate aspects of one's nature.[2] We therefore should reject the Stoic view of passions and their ideal (§VI). Finally, the goal of passionless invulnerability is not truly human. When we attempt to remove our passions and the vulnerability that they entail, we *mutilate* our nature. We force our soul to become callous, as it were, and insensitive, which is an assault on our nature, not its fulfillment. The pursuit of a passionless, invulnerable state in this life, then, is not only unnatural, but dangerous (§VII).

§I Stoic Value and the Invulnerability of Stoic Happiness

To understand Plutarch's criticism of Stoic ethics, their ideal, and their view of human nature, we must start with the Stoics' view of value and their notion that the virtuous are invulnerable to what is outside their control. For the Stoics, the sage is the perfect human being who has reached the end-goal (τέλος) of human nature and thus achieved its fulfillment. He alone is happy, since happiness (εὐδαιμονία) wholly depends on one's virtue and the Stoics identify virtue and being virtuous with happiness and being happy.[3] The sage's virtue, moreover, is entirely within his power, since virtue is up to us (ἐφ' ἡμίν).[4] Circumstances, no matter how bad or good they may appear to the non-sage, are irrelevant to the sage's happiness; the sage's virtue is not affected by circumstances. Nothing outside his own choice can affect his happiness, since nothing can have an impact on the virtuous state of his soul apart from his own choices.[5]

---

[2] The English translations might not bring it across, but the underlying Greek terms ἀλλοτρίωσις ("alienation") and οἰκείωσις ("appropriation" / "identification") are contraries.

[3] Stob. 2.7.6a (p. 71, l. 15–p. 72, l. 6)=*SVF* 3.106=LS 60M; D.L. 7.89=*SVF* 3.39=LS 61A, 7.127–28=*SVF* 3.49; *SVF* 3.50–67, 3.78, 3.107. Cf. Nussbaum 1994, p. 361.

[4] Epictetus, *Discourses* 1.1.7=LS 62K; cf. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *On Fate* 196.24–197.3=*SVF* 2.984=LS 61M and Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 5.81–2=LS 63M. Virtue and vice are brought about by our rational choices and powers (D.L. 7.85–6=*SVF* 3.178=LS 57A; Seneca, *Letters* 124.13–14=LS 60H) and virtue consists in the optimal condition of the commanding-faculty (ἡγεμονικόν, Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 440E–441D=LS 61B; S.E. *Against the Professors* 11.22–6=*SVF* 3.75=LS 60G).

[5] Cf. Simplicius, *On Aristotle's Categories* 8.401.34–6 Kalbfleisch=*SVF* 3.238; Clement, *Miscellanies* 4.22.627=*SVF* 3.240.

What is outside his power to control, then, makes *no difference* to his virtue and thus to his happiness.

"Conventional goods," such as life, health, pleasure, beauty, strength, wealth, etc., what we as non-sages refer to as goods, are, as the Stoics call them, "indifferents" (ἀδιάφορα).[6] They may be preferable (προηγμένα), both to have and to pursue, and they may also in a limited way be valuable in themselves,[7] but whether or not we *succeed* in obtaining or retaining them makes no difference to our happiness. What matters for virtue is doing all that is within one's power to obtain and use these items in the appropriate manner, at the appropriate time, etc. As explained in the analogy of an archer aiming at a target, aiming well is within one's control but *succeeding* in hitting the target is not entirely within one's control.[8] One can miss the target if an unforeseen gust of wind blows the arrow off course or if someone moves the target. Likewise, we can be deprived of conventional goods or thwarted in our efforts to obtain them by forces outside our control. Happiness, because it depends wholly on virtue, however, is entirely within our control. These items, then, cannot ultimately contribute to our happiness nor take anything away from it, since they are not entirely within our control.[9]

---

[6] Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1048A1–8=*SVF* 3.137=LS 58H; D.L. 7.101–3=LS 58A; Stob. 2.7.7a (p. 79, l. 18–p. 80, l. 13)=LS 58C; *SVF* 3.127–39.

[7] Stob. 2.7.7g (p. 84, l. 18–p. 85, l. 11)=*SVF* 3.128=LS58E. See nn. 64–5 below.

[8] Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1070F–71E=LS 64C, 1072C–F=*SVF* 3.59=LS 64D; Cicero, *On Ends* 3.22=*SVF* 3.18=LS 64F. For a discussion of the archer analogy as an explication of Stoic views by Antipater in response to Carneades see Long 1967, pp. 75–86. Cf. also Inwood 1985, p. 212; 1986; 2014, pp. 86–7.

[9] D.L. 7.104=*SVF* 3.104=LS 58B: Indifferents for the Stoics are "what contribute neither to happiness nor to unhappiness, as holds true for wealth, glory, health, strength and the like, since it is possible to be happy without these things" (τὰ μήτε πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν μήτε πρὸς κακοδαιμονίαν συνεργοῦντα, ὡς ἔχει πλοῦτος, δόξα, ὑγίεια, ἰσχὺς καὶ τὰ ὅμοια· ἐνδέχεται γὰρ καὶ χωρὶς τούτων εὐδαιμονεῖν). Cf. Cicero, *On Ends* 3.50; Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1060B. Cf. also Sorabji 2000, p. 208: "The Stoic sage will not be upset if, through no fault of his, he 'misses' and fails to secure the selected indifferent. That leaves the indifferents just that—indifferent—and does not allow them to serve as grounds for emotional concern."

Virtue, then, is of absolute value for the Stoics. The value of conventional goods, whether we succeed in obtaining them or not, adds nothing to one's virtue. To have virtue is to be completely happy. Nor do these items *add* to our virtue or happiness, since happiness and virtue do not come in degrees. Every sage is equally as happy as any other sage.[10] Whether one is in possession of many conventional goods or deprived of them makes no difference to a sage's happiness. Whatever value conventional goods have cannot, then, contribute to or compare with the absolute value of virtue, since the Stoics adhere to a notion of ordinal value.[11] Virtue alone belongs to the class of absolute value that overrides any and all value attached to conventional goods, which do not add to, detract from, or compare with the value of virtue. Virtue stands in a class of its own.[12]

This view of the Stoic sage, his virtue, and his happiness renders him *invulnerable*.[13] That tenet alone is sufficient to set the Stoics on a collision course with human passion (τὸ πάθος), since passions by their very nature make us vulnerable. They draw us to value what is outside our control and to be *affected* (πάσχειν / παθεῖν) by what is not within our power. Love for friends and family, for instance, can lead to feelings of grief at their loss. Our happiness, to some extent, becomes a hostage to fortune and circumstances when we attach value to people and situations outside our control.[14]

---

[10] D.L. 7.127=LS 61I; Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1061F=*SVF* 3.54=LS 63I, 1063A–B=*SVF* 3.549=LS 61T, 1076A=LS 61J; *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1039E=*SVF* 3.761=LS 60Q and 1038C–D.

[11] Cf. Zimmerman 2015.

[12] Stob. 2.7.7g (p. 84, l. 18–p. 85, l. 11)=*SVF* 3.128=LS 58E: Preferable conventional goods are likened to the class of subordinates beneath the king, virtue. Cicero, *On Ends* 3.33–4=*SVF* 3.72=LS 60D: The good is supremely valuable, a value of a different kind, not of a different magnitude from conventional goods.

[13] Cicero, *Tusculan Disputation* 5.40–1=LS 63L: The virtuous man is secure (*tutus*), impregnable (*inexpugnabilis*), hemmed and walled in (*saeptus et munitus*); he is not afraid of losing anything because his happiness is invulnerable to what is outside his control.

[14] Cf. Knuuttila and Sihvola 1998, p. 16: "Emotional responses are actualized when contingent external things are found to be important and valuable. Thus, the emotions are typically connected with confronting the contingencies of the external world. If one regards them as constituents of the good life, as Aristotle did, *one will also accept*

§II Invulnerability and the Elimination of Passions (ἀπάθεια)

To maintain the invulnerability of happiness, which the Stoics equate with virtue, passions must be *eliminated*. The Stoic sage's happiness cannot be invested in anything apart from virtue; he must value virtue alone as absolutely valuable. Virtue is the sole good and vice the only bad for the Stoics.[15] To value anything as good or bad apart from virtue and vice, then, is to have a false belief about value.[16] Because they lead us to value other human beings and things outside our control, such as death and suffering, as though these things were good or bad, passions lead to false beliefs. Invulnerability and the Stoic conception of virtue, then, will require the absence of all passion (ἀπάθεια).

Within the Stoic conception of nature and the order of the universe, passions must also be *eliminable* from human nature. If the end-goal and fulfillment (τέλος) of human nature is obtainable, it must be possible to be in a state completely lacking in passions. Happiness is, by one Stoic expression, living in agreement with nature (τὸ ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν),[17] both with one's own human nature and with the nature of the whole.[18] Since the Stoics believe

---

vulnerability as a basic human condition. Emotions thus connect us to things that are not wholly under our control." Emphasis added. Cf. also Sorabji 2000, pp. 181–4.

[15] Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1042A=*SVF* 3.55=LS 63H and *On Common Notions* 1061F=*SVF* 3.54=LS 63I. Cf. Cicero, *On Duties* 3.16; *On Ends* 5.95.

[16] Pseudo-Andronicus, *On Passions* 1=*SVF* 3.391=LS 65B (on the spurious attribution of *On Emotions* to Andronicus of Rhodes see Glibert-Thirry 1977, pp. 30–4); Stob. 2.7.10 (p. 88, l. 22–p. 89, l. 3)=*SVF* 3.378=LS 65C; Galen, *On Hippocrates' and Plato's Doctrines* 4.2.1–6=*SVF* 3.463=LS 65D, 4.5.21–5=*SVF* 3.480=LS 65L, 4.7.12–17=*SVF* 3.466=LS 65O; Epictetus, *Handbook* 5=LS 65U; and Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.61, 3.68, 3.70, 3.77–8, 4.61. Cf. Irwin 1998, pp. 221–4: "The Stoics believe that uncompromising attachment is the mark of believing that something is good. The Stoic is attached in this way to virtue, and so is not willing to listen to arguments that invite trading virtue for something else. This uncompromising attitude is characteristic of passions" (p. 224). Cf. also Long and Sedley 1987, vol. 1, p. 420; Sorabji 2000, pp. 181–4.

[17] Stob. 2.7.6a (p. 75, l. 11–p. 76, l. 8)=LS 63B; cf. Stob. 2.7.5b5 (p. 63, l. 25–p. 64, l. 12)=LS 63G; 2.7.6e (p. 77, ll. 16–27)=*SVF* 3.16=LS 63A; and Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 5.81–2=LS 63M.

[18] D.L. 7.87–9=LS 63C: "The end is to live in accordance with nature, which is according to one's own nature and according to the nature of the whole" (τέλος γίνεται τὸ ἀκολούθως τῇ φύσει ζῆν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ κατά τε τὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν ὅλων, 88). "Chrysippus understands nature in terms of common and individual human nature" (φύσιν δὲ Χρύσιππος μὲν ἐξακούει, ᾗ ἀκολούθως δεῖ ζῆν, τήν τε κοινὴν καὶ ἰδίως τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην, 89).

that the natural order of the universe makes the end of human nature possible, they also believe that it must be possible to remove passions entirely from that nature.

This view, in turn, informs the Stoic conception of the human soul. Stoic psychology is monistic; the soul is uniform, singular, and not composed of parts. Unlike the Platonic tripartite soul that appears in the *Republic*, *Timaeus*, and *Phaedrus*, the human soul in Stoic psychology lacks non-rational parts that are separate from the single commanding-faculty (ἡγεμονικόν) of the soul. For the Stoics, the essential nature of the human soul is rational,[19] and to reach the fulfillment of human nature is to become perfected in our rationality.[20] Plutarch himself reports as much in *On Moral Virtue*:

[T1] καὶ νομίζουσιν οὐκ εἶναι τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἄλογον διαφορᾷ τινι καὶ φύσει[21] τοῦ λογικοῦ διακεκριμένον, ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος, ὃ δὴ καλοῦσι διάνοιαν καὶ ἡγεμονικόν, δι' ὅλου τρεπόμενον καὶ μεταβάλλον ἔν τε τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ ταῖς καθ' ἕξιν ἢ διάθεσιν μεταβολαῖς κακίαν τε γίνεσθαι καὶ ἀρετήν, καὶ μηδὲν ἔχειν ἄλογον ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

> And they [the Stoics] think that the passionate and non-rational part is not separated by any difference or in its nature from the rational part but is the same part of the soul, which they call thought and the commanding-faculty. And [they think that] this commanding-faculty, by turning itself and changing in its passions and in alterations according to its condition and disposition as a whole, becomes vice and virtue. And [they think that] it does not have a non-rational part in itself.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Virue* 441C4–10=LS 61B)

Passions on the Stoic view are instances of irrationality.[22] They are errors in belief when the mind is altered and in a non-virtuous state. Passions are *irrational* in a normative sense, not

[19] Seneca, *Letters* 76.9–10=LS 63D; Calcidius 220=*SVF* 2.879=LS 53G; Aetius 4.21.1–4=*SVF* 2.836=LS 53H. Cf. Long and Sedley 1987, vol. 1, p. 383: The soul is "is rational through and through."

[20] Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 441C1–4=LS 61B: "All of these men suppose in common that virtue is a certain disposition of the commanding-faculty of the soul that comes about by reason, and, moreover, that this [disposition] itself is reason that is in agreement, is steadfast, and unchangeable" (κοινῶς δ' ἅπαντες οὗτοι τὴν ἀρετὴν τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς διάθεσίν τινα καὶ δύναμιν γεγενημένην ὑπὸ λόγου, μᾶλλον δὲ λόγον οὖσαν αὐτὴν ὁμολογούμενον καὶ βέβαιον καὶ ἀμετάπτωτον ὑποτίθενται). Cf. Annas 1992, pp. 61–70 and 115–20.

[21] Following Hartman in the deletion of ψυχῆς after φύσει.

[22] Stob. 2.7.10 (p. 88, l. 8–p. 90, l. 6)=*SVF* 3.378, 389=LS 65A and LS 61B. Cf. also Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 449D7–9: "For every passion is an error according to them [the Stoics], and everyone who feels grief or fear or

merely *non*-rational as something different from reason, as though springing from a non-rational part (τὸ ἄλογον) that is different from a rational part in the soul.[23]

Because the Stoics hold passions to be instances of irrationality within the soul, passions are eliminated in the process of perfecting the soul, i.e. by perfecting one's rationality. Extirpation or eradication of passions (ἀπάθεια) would not, then, be an *uprooting* as the etymologies of "eradication" and "extirpation" suggest.[24] We need not cut out the source of our passions, as though digging out parts of the soul that issue in passions and are separable from the commanding-faculty (ἡγεμονικόν) of the soul. The human soul *is* the commanding-faculty with no separable parts. Nor is a "pathectomy" required, as though one could remove a disease that inhabits the soul. Passions are diseased *states* of the commanding-faculty,[25] and they are removed in the process of improving its function. Extirpation of emotion, on this view, is improvement of rational function. Removing error and debugging our mental faculties, as it were, will result in the complete elimination of passions on the Stoic account of the soul and the nature of passions.

This view of human nature and its perfection is still grounded in the embodied state, since the soul is itself physical for Stoics. The commanding-faculty is a physical structure and all the functions of the soul, including thoughts, passions, and desires, are functions of this physical structure.[26] In fulfilling human nature, then, the sage does not become something *other* than

---

desire is committing an error" (πᾶν μὲν γὰρ πάθος ἁμαρτία κατ' αὐτούς ἐστι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λυπούμενος ἢ φοβούμενος ἢ ἐπιθυμῶν ἁμαρτάνει); *On the Cleverness of Animals* 961D1–2: "They [the Stoics] are in agreement that all passions in general are 'bad judgments and beliefs'" (τὰ δὲ πάθη σύμπαντα κοινῶς 'κρίσεις φαύλας καὶ δόξας' ὁμολογοῦντες εἶναι). Cf. Nussbaum 1994, pp. 80–1 and 369–70; Annas 1992, pp. 106–10; Krentz 2008, pp. 124–6.

[23] Sellars 2006, p. 117: For Stoics, passions are "the product of mistaken judgements" that "should play no part in the life of a properly functioning rational being." Cf. Nussbaum 1994, pp. 80–1, 369–70; Annas 1992, pp. 106–10.

[24] From Latin *eradicare* and *ex*(*s*)*tirpare*, "ripping up from (*e-*/*ex-*) the roots (*radices* / *stirpes*)".

[25] Seneca, *Letters* 22.15, 85.3–5, 116.1=*SVF* 3.443; Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.13–31, 61–3; *SVF* 3.444, 447. Cf. Nussbaum 1994, p. 389; Irwin 1998, p. 223.

[26] Aetius 4.21.4=*SVF* 2.836=LS 53H. Cf. Powers 2012, p. 257: The Stoics "ascribe to the *hēgemonikon* control over *all* an animals life functions."

human, since the Stoics consider human nature's perfection to be found in its rationality. Dion, the human sage, is equal to Zeus, the supreme god of the universe, because he is fully virtuous, i.e. is perfected in his rationality.[27] To be like god for the Stoics is to be fully rational but to do so while remaining distinctively human.

§III Human Nature and the Phenomena of Human Experience

We will see in Chapter 6 that Plutarch also believes that the fulfillment of human nature is found in becoming like god while still remaining fully human. For Plutarch, however, both the way in which the Stoics conceive of this goal and their view of human nature are false. Passions cannot be entirely eliminated from human nature, even as we become like god, since they are essential components of our nature. As we will explore in this section, Plutarch rejects the Stoic view of human nature, arguing that the soul must be composed of non-rational as well as rational parts. Common human experience, Plutarch argues, reveals that we have both non-rational and rational aspects to our nature that are separate and distinct from each other. The Stoics may deny this reality in their monistic psychology, but it is to their own theory's detriment. The phenomena of critical psychic conflict, which we will explore below, reveal that the Stoics' understanding of the soul and their view on its passions are false.[28]

Plutarch takes experiences of psychic conflict to be common phenomena, such as when we feel a desire to do something contrary to our own convictions. In cases like these, we often feel as though two separate forces are pulling us in different directions about the same thing. Now, if there really are two different motions in the soul that are acting directly against one another, urging us to pursue and to avoid the same thing, at the same time, and in the same

[27] Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1076A=LS 61J. Cf. Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1038C–D.
[28] Cf. Ingenkamp 1999; Opsomer 2012, pp. 315–17.

respect, then how can the soul be just one thing itself and not be either two things or have two things within it that are at variance with one another? Psychic conflict so described seems to be *critical*, i.e. it appears to reveal that two things that are opposed are distinct from one another.[29]

This problem, which Plutarch raises against Stoic psychology, comes straight from the argument for soul-partition that Socrates gives in *Republic* 4. When we experience critical psychic conflict, such as when there is a motion of conviction or judgment that deems an act not-to-be-done or an object not-to-be-taken and a contrary motion of a desire to-do or to-take (439c6–d2), we find that there must be two different things at work within the soul:

[T2] δῆλον ὅτι ταὐτὸν τἀναντία ποιεῖν ἢ πάσχειν κατὰ ταὐτόν γε καὶ πρὸς ταὐτὸν οὐκ ἐθελήσει ἅμα, ὥστε ἄν που εὑρίσκωμεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ταῦτα γιγνόμενα, εἰσόμεθα ὅτι οὐ ταὐτὸν ἦν ἀλλὰ πλείω.

> It is clear that the same thing will not be willing to do or suffer contraries in the same respect,[30] in relation to the same thing, at the same time. Thus, if ever we discover these things happening in the soul, we will know that it is not the same thing, but more than one. (Plato, *Republic* 4, 436b9–c2)

As explained in one of the earliest formulations of the principle of non-contradiction, one thing cannot be at variance with itself with regard to the same thing, at the same time, in the same respect, etc. Where there is a favorable attitude and its contrary in the same respect, in relation to the same thing, and at the same time, there will be one subject that holds the favorable attitude and another that holds the contrary. Whether we describe these contrary motions as desires,

---

[29] It is *critical*, as the etymology suggests, because the subjects are discerned to be separated and distinct (κρίνεσθαι). Cf. Plutarch, *On Moral Progress* 448C6–10.

[30] In the passage quoted here, I have translated κατὰ ταὐτόν γε in 436b9–10 as "in the same respect," departing from the 1997 translation of Grube and Reeve (in John Cooper, *Plato: Complete Works*) of "in the same part of itself." My reason for doing so is that the case of the spinning top that follows in 436d4–e5 represents a difference in movement in *respect* and not in *part*. All parts of the top move with respect to rotation, but do not move with respect to the axis. Additionally, my translation mirrors more closely the reformulation in 436e7–437a1: ("No such statement will disturb us, then, or make us believe that the same thing can be, do, or undergo opposites, at the same time, *in the same respect*, and in relation to the same thing," *per* Grube and Reeve with emphasis added (οὐδὲν ἄρα ἡμᾶς τῶν τοιούτων λεγόμενον ἐκπλήξει, οὐδὲ μᾶλλόν τι πείσει ὡς ποτέ τι ἂν τὸ αὐτὸ ὂν ἅμα κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ τἀναντία πάθοι ἢ καὶ εἴη ἢ καὶ ποιήσειεν).

convictions, or attitudes, we find that when they pull us in opposing directions in a critical manner, they require that the two forces belong to two things that are opposed to one another. Call this the "Principle of Opposites."

As the Principle of Opposites establishes in *Republic* 4, we cannot have a single psychological subject that performs two contrary motions, the favorable attitude and its contrary, to the same object, at the same time, etc. This is not to say that the two subjects of the contrary motions cannot be parts of a common subject, but that, inasmuch as they are subjects of contrary motions, they must be treated as separate subjects, or separate parts. In the *Republic*, the example of the archer both pulling and pushing is apt. While the archer is, in some sense, the common subject that pulls and pushes, it is strictly speaking more correct to distinguish two parts of that archer that are the subjects of the opposing motions: one hand pushes the bow while the other hand pulls the string (439b8–c1).

Given that experiences of critical psychic conflict are common and require that more than one psychological subject is at work, how, Plutarch asks, can the Stoics explain these experiences? Within the Stoics' single-subject, monistic psychology, the same mind cannot allow for two different subjects of conflicting attitudes at the same time, not even as different parts of the same psyche, since the soul is uniform. The Stoic response to this challenge, as Plutarch reports, is to deny the possibility of critical psychic conflict altogether:

[T3] ὅτι μὲν οὖν γίνεταί τις ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τοιαύτης ἑτερότητος αἴσθησις καὶ διαφορᾶς περὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ὥς τινος μαχομένου καὶ τἀναντία λέγοντος αὐταῖς, οὐκ ἄδηλόν ἐστιν. ἔνιοι δέ φασιν οὐχ ἕτερον εἶναι τοῦ λόγου τὸ πάθος οὐδὲ δυεῖν διαφορὰν καὶ στάσιν, ἀλλ' ἑνὸς λόγου τροπὴν ἐπ' ἀμφότερα, λανθάνουσαν ἡμᾶς ὀξύτητι καὶ τάχει μεταβολῆς, οὐ συνορῶντας ὅτι ταὐτόν ἐστι τῆς ψυχῆς ᾧ πέφυκεν ἐπιθυμεῖν καὶ μετανοεῖν, ὀργίζεσθαι καὶ δεδιέναι, φέρεσθαι πρὸς τὸ αἰσχρὸν ὑφ' ἡδονῆς καὶ φερομένης πάλιν αὐτῆς ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι.

> It is clearly the case that some perception of discord and conflict of this kind occurs within the soul as it concerns one's desires, just as though someone were fighting and giving commands contrary to these desires. But some [the Stoics] say that passion is not different from reason, and they deny that there is conflict and strife between the two. Instead, they claim that it [the experience of discord] is a turning of a single reason in two directions, which eludes us due to the swiftness and suddenness of the change, since we are unable to see within our limited purview that all of these activities naturally belong to the same aspect of the soul: desiring and changing our mind, growing angry and fearful, being carried off into shame because of pleasure, even as the soul is brought back to take hold of itself again. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 446E8–447A4=*SVF* 3.459=LS 65G)

Plutarch begins here by presenting the usual psychic partition of reason and desire from *Republic* 4: the someone (τις) fighting and giving commands is the rational part of the soul that opposes desires arising from the appetitive part of the soul. Then follows the Stoic reply, which denies the experience of critical psychic conflict. According to the Stoics, what people presume to be an experience of synchronic conflict is really just a very quick change of direction within a single mind. There is no critical conflict of simultaneous variance within the soul at all.

When people feel as though they continue to have conflicting attitudes within their soul, they experience nothing other than a quick change of attitudes but fail to take notice of the changes. As in the last example, the mind has changed direction and gotten ahold of itself again by the time the supposed conflict is thought to occur. It merely *appears* that the better judgment was in place when the contrary shameful course was undertaken, as one was swept away by passion. Instead, it is something of an after-effect to feel as though the desire is still in place once we have changed our minds, not a concurrent experience of a desire contrary to our decision. Being swept away by pleasure was a failed mental state followed by a better judgment, the Stoics argue, not an experience of a synchronic conflict. The mind can change direction, but not be split in two opposing directions or against itself at the same time.[31]

[31] For further discussion of this passage see Gill 1983a, pp. 142–5; Dillon 1983; Campbell 1985, esp. pp. 327–31. See also the preceding note.

This is a bad move according to Plutarch. The Stoic response is grossly inadequate to account for *normal* human experience; it is contrary to what is clear and distinct evidence and contrary to our normal human perceptions (παρὰ τὴν ἐνάργειάν ἐστι καὶ τὴν αἴσθησιν, *On Moral Virtue* 447A12–B1).[32] Not only is the Stoic view contrary to our experience of synchronic psychic discord, which Plutarch thinks we have no good reason to deny, but their explanation of unnoticeable changes in intention also fails to account for an enduring sense of internal conflict. Plutarch asks us to imagine the example of inappropriate romantic urges or feelings (*On Moral Virtue* 447B3–11). The lover in such cases suffers an experience of erotic desire that his rational judgment condemns as inappropriate and to-be-avoided. He nonetheless continues to feel these urges and emotions despite his attempts to quell them. Contrary to the Stoic explanation, he has not made unnoticeably quick successions back and forth between experiencing love and making a judgment to condemn that love. He *sees* this impropriety of his feelings and *feels* those passions at the same time. He senses a conflict within himself that we have no good reason to doubt.[33]

The conclusion to be drawn from such cases, Plutarch argues, is that the soul is not a monistic subject as presented in Stoic psychology. Plato's dialogues already provide a psychological description that accounts for such psychological phenomena: a soul composed of a rational part and two non-rational parts (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 441F7–442B2; *Platonic*

[32] Plutarch's criticism even hints that the Stoics undermine their own notion of certain self-revealing perceptions of the world, a correspondence theory of perception with "secure representations" (καταληπτικαὶ φαντασίαι). If critical psychological conflict is clear and distinct evidence (ἐνάργεια), and Stoics nonetheless deny it, then they are failing to meet their own standards in forming a secure representation (καταληπτικὴ φαντασία) of their internal psychological states. For the sense of "clear and distinct evidence" in perception (ἐνάργεια) see Theophrastus's philosophical definition of τὸ ἐναργές as the criterion of truth for the perception of both sensible items (αἰσθητά) and intelligible items (νοητά, S.E., *Against the Professors* 7.218). See also the Epicurean definition in Epicurus, *Letter to Herodotus* 71; *PHerc*. 1431(=fr. 36.22 Arrighetti) and *PHerc*. 1479/1417(=fr. 31.21 Arrighetti). The term ἐνάργεια is often a technical term for vivid description in literary analysis. On these points see Zanker 1981.
[33] Cf. Ingenkamp 1999; Gourinat 2007, pp. 215–47.

Questions 9, 1008B7–10). This understanding of the soul assigns passions to non-rational aspects that are part of human nature and does not require that passions be errors of thought. Passions are *non*-rational, but not necessarily *irrational*. As functions of parts of the soul that are *other* than reason, they need not be opposed to reason, but may be in conformity and agreement with reason.[34]

Passions, moreover, are essential components of human nature according to Plutarch. I will discuss the necessity of passion in greater detail in the next two chapters, but here I present a few points in Plutarch's moral psychology that contrast sharply with Stoic psychology and their goal of eliminating passions. As I discuss further in the next chapter, passions and the non-rational passionate parts of the soul are necessary features of embodiment for Plutarch.[35] Passions and the non-rational parts of the soul from which they issue are not eliminable from our nature in this life.[36] Passions are, moreover, necessary for the care of our bodies and serve certain useful and necessary functions for life, being teleologically oriented to certain good ends.[37] Passions, then, are not only necessary and ineliminable, Plutarch argues, but useful and beneficial.

§IV Invulnerability and the Cost of Friendship

Plutarch believes that the Stoic view of human nature not only is false, but also comes at a great cost to their ethics, particularly as it concerns friendship. In this section and the two that follow, we will explore what I believe to be Plutarch's most damning criticisms of Stoic ethics and their view of human nature. Focusing his attack on Stoic invulnerability, Plutarch reveals

[34] Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 446D1–E2; 448D7–10. Cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 442c9–d2; 9, 589a6–b6.
[35] Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 450E6–F1, 450F6–451B5; *On the Sign of Socrates* 591D5–7; *On the Face in the Moon* 943A6–7.
[36] Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 443C9–10; *Consolation to Apollonius* 102C5–E1=[T16].
[37] Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451D5–9.

that the Stoic ethical system leads to an *inhumane* and *inhuman* goal. It is an inhumane goal, Plutarch argues, because it comes at the cost of true friendship and genuine concern for others. We cannot truly care for others unless their well-being affects our own; we cannot be true friends unless we embrace emotional vulnerability. Even if we could eliminate passions, as the Stoics aim to do, Plutarch argues that we *should* not. Friendship is both natural and a very great good that enriches human life.

The Stoic goal of invulnerability is also inhuman because invulnerability requires the mutilation of our nature, not its perfection. The Stoic aim of rendering the sage free from all passions amounts to an attempt to make the soul callous and insensitive, incapable of fulfilling its own natural functions. The *summum bonum* of virtue and the fulfillment of human nature exemplified by the Stoic sage, Plutarch argues, is *not* natural and is actually *less* than human.

Let us begin with Plutarch's attack on the Stoic conception of friendship. Most people consider a true friend to be one who is affected by the well-being of her friends. If I am a true friend, I will be distressed at my friend's misfortunes and share in the joy of her successes. If my friend is treated unjustly, I will be pained at her mistreatment and angry at the perpetrators.[38] On this view, one's happiness is vulnerable to the well-being of one's friends.[39] Plutarch shares this view on friendship and happiness. This vulnerability, moreover, is itself characteristic of a good person for Plutarch. The good man (ὁ χρηστός), Plutarch writes, is seen

[T4] καὶ τὸ κηδεμονικὸν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον οὐ χρείαις οὐδὲ πράξεσι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ συναλγεῖν πταίουσι καὶ κατορθοῦσι συγχαίρειν ἐπιδεικνύμενος.

> displaying both his care and humaneness toward others, not only by his useful actions, but also by sharing in the grief of their misfortunes and sharing in the joy of their successes. (Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft* 823A9–B1)

[38] Cf. Nussbaum 1994, pp. 402–38, esp. 405, 425–7. Cf. also Sorabji 2000, p. 190. I discuss justified anger further in Chapters 3 and 4.
[39] For a discussion of this intuition in contemporary philosophy see Kolodny 2003, pp. 151–2.

The good man demonstrates his care and concern not merely by meeting obligations or by benefitting others through useful actions, but also by his shared vested interest in the well-being of others. He is affected together with them, sharing in their joy and grief. His empathy, moreover, is proof (ἐπίδειξις) of his care and humaneness (τὸ κηδεμονικὸν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον).[40] As we will see below, not only is it the mark of a *good* person to be affected by the condition of others, in shared grief or joy, but it is essential to the very notion of friendship for Plutarch (*On Moral Virtue* 451E4–6=[T6]).

The Stoics do not share this view of friendship. They try to capture many key features of it within their own conception of friendship, but they jettison certain aspects to maintain the sage's invulnerability. As we will see, despite their attempts they often fail to do more than provide an appearance of friendship void of its central components, since vulnerability lies at the heart of genuine friendship. The Stoics claim, for instance, that the sage always benefits his friends.[41] This claim is suspect, however, given the Stoic view of what is actually good and beneficial, as Plutarch himself argues:

[T5] εἰ δὲ μὴ [οἱ θεοί, D5] δύνανται ποιεῖν ἀγαθούς, οὐδ' ὠφελεῖν δύνανται, μηδενός γε τῶν ἄλλων ὄντος ἀγαθοῦ μηδ' ὠφελίμου.

> But if [the gods] are not able to make humans virtuous, then they are not able to benefit them, if there is nothing among the other things that is good or beneficial.
> (Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1048D6–8)

The Stoics deny that anyone can *make* anyone else good, i.e. virtuous. Virtue, the only good and the only good-making quality, is brought about by one's own choices (αὐθαίρετον) and is up to

[40] On the importance of φιλανθρωπία in Plutarch's thought see Alexiou 2008, pp. 371–2: As a concept originally tied to the gods' benevolent attitudes toward humans, Plutarch seeks throughout his works to connect this attitude to human virtue. I will return to this connection in Chapter 6. Cf. also Martin 1961 and Fialho 2007.
[41] D.L. 7.104; Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1068F and 1076A; Stob. 2.7.11d (p. 95, ll. 6–8); Cicero, *On Ends* 3.33.

each individual (*On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1048D2). Not even the gods, then, can make anyone virtuous. But, if the gods cannot make humans virtuous, they cannot *benefit* them, i.e. they cannot *make them good* or provide good to them. So, Plutarch argues, the Stoics cut their own feet out from under themselves when they claim that virtue is entirely within one's own control while also claiming that the virtuous can benefit others. What could it mean for the gods, much less a sage, to benefit another if they cannot make others good, i.e. make them virtuous?[42]

The Stoics also try to capture another feature of friendship by claiming that the sage exhibits benevolence (εὔνοια), which, by their own definition, "is a well-reasoned desire for the good of another for their own sake" (ἐστι βούλησις ἀγαθῶν ⟨ἑτέρῳ⟩ αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐκείνου).[43] This definition seems very close to Aristotle's own formulation.[44] Aristotle defines a true friend as one who seeks the good of his friend for their own sake (ἐκείνου ἕνεκα), and he establishes benevolence as a necessary component of friendship.[45] The Stoics also agree with Aristotle that

---

[42] Boys-Stones (1996, pp. 593–4) argues that Plutarch's point in [T5] really only applies to the ability of gods to benefit *non*-sages. While that certainly is the thrust of the argument, especially leading up to [T5] (1048C9–D6), Boys-Stones misses the greater impact of the argument on the Stoic notion of benefitting others, which also applies to the claim that those who are already virtuous benefit each other, both gods and sages. Although the Stoics claim that sages and gods always benefit one another, that is, the virtuous benefit the virtuous (Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1076A), that notion of benefit is an empty conceit if it only means providing material to be *used* by another sage in his exercise of virtue. Preferred indifferents do not *contribute* to one's virtue insofar as their presence or absence is outside one's control. That is why the Stoics call them indifferents. Even the promotion, or encouragement of one's virtue by others cannot add to or bring about virtue, since it is outside one's own control. (Cf. D.L. 7.104; *SVF* 3.78; Stob. 2.7.11d (p. 95, ll. 6–8); Cicero, *On Ends* 3.33.) Nor can any of these influences *add* to one's virtue, since virtue and happiness do not come in degrees. Plutarch thus concludes, if the gods, and by implication, the Stoic sage, cannot confer virtue, the Stoic concept of benefit is ultimately empty.

[43] Pseudo-Andronicus, *On Passions* 6.2=*SVF* 4.432. I follow Kreuttner in accepting Wachsmuth's addition of ἑτέρῳ. Cf. Clement, *The Teacher* 1.8.63.1–2=*SVF* 2.1116=LS 60I. Cf. also Long 1996b; Engberg-Pedersen 1998; and Graver 2007, pp. 53–60.

[44] Note the conceptual and verbal similarities in Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.2, 1155b31–4: "They say that one must *desire the good of one's friend for their own sake*, and they say that those who desire good in this way are *benevolent*, even if it is not mutual and [this desire for one's own good] does not come from the other, since friendship is *benevolence* in reciprocation" (τῷ δὲ φίλῳ φασὶ δεῖν βούλεσθαι τἀγαθὰ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα. τοὺς δὲ βουλομένους οὕτω τἀγαθὰ εὔνους λέγουσιν, ἂν μὴ ταὐτὸ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου γίνηται· εὔνοιαν γὰρ ἐν ἀντιπεπονθόσι φιλίαν εἶναι). On Stoic knowledge of Aristotle's ethics and ethical works see Long 1968a; Sandbach 1985, pp. 24–30.

[45] *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.2, 1155b31–4; 8.2, 1156a3–4; 8.3, 1156b7–11; 9.5, 1167a7–10; *Rhetoric* 2.4, 1380b35–1380a10; 2.4, 1381a13; *Great Ethics* 2.12.8–9; *Eudemian Ethics* 7.7, 1241a3–14. Cf. also Annas 1977, p. 534. On

one must not only have a benevolent *attitude* toward friends but also *do* all that is within one's power (τὸ κατὰ δύναμιν πρακτικόν) to benefit them.[46] The sage, according to the Stoics, perfectly pursues all actions that are appropriate to virtue, including his obligations to friends, by doing his utmost to fulfill them in all situations.[47]

The Stoics deny, however, that we can be affected by the conditions of our friends, since their successes, failures, and well-being will always be, to some extent, outside our control. Here they depart from our common conception of friendship, as well as Plutarch's and Aristotle's views.[48] Benevolence, for the Stoics, is a species of the "good feelings" (εὐπάθειαι) that the sage alone has,[49] but good feelings, the Stoics claim, are not like normal human passions. They do not render us vulnerable to anything outside our own virtue.[50] Stoic joy (χαρά), and even benevolence (εὔνοια), are completely *unaffected* by circumstances outside one's control. These feelings are due to the virtuous condition of the soul, which, again, in the Stoic view is completely within our own control and immune to changes in circumstances. With the category of εὐπάθεια, the Stoics attempt to save certain positive aspects of what we normally think of as

---

questions of authorship of the *Great Ethics* see Rowe 1975 and Kenny 1978, pp. 215–39, who argue that it is not a genuine work by Aristotle, and Cooper 1999d, who mounts more recent arguments in defense of Aristotle's authorship.

[46] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.4, 1380b35–1380a10 (partially quoted in n. 48 below). Cf. *Eudemian Ethics* 7.7, 1241a3–14; *Nicomachean Ethics* 9.5, 1167a7–10.

[47] Galen, *On Hippocrates' and Plato's Doctrines* 5.6.10=LS 64I; Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1071A=LS 64C.

[48] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.4, 1380b35–1380a5: "Let being a friend be wishing what one supposes to be good for another for their own sake, not just for oneself, and being actively engaged in producing the good as far as one is able. A friend, moreover, is one who is friendly in reciprocation and those who suppose that they are thus disposed toward one another suppose that they are friends. With these conditions established, it is necessary that a friend *shares in the pleasure of his friend's good and shares in the grief of his pains* for no other reason than on account of his friend." (ἔστω δὴ τὸ φιλεῖν τὸ βούλεσθαί τινι ἃ οἴεται ἀγαθά, ἐκείνου ἕνεκα ἀλλὰ μὴ αὑτοῦ, καὶ τὸ κατὰ δύναμιν πρακτικὸν εἶναι τούτων. φίλος δέ ἐστιν ὁ φιλῶν καὶ ἀντιφιλούμενος· οἴονται δὲ φίλοι εἶναι οἱ οὕτως ἔχειν οἰόμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους. τούτων δὲ ὑποκειμένων ἀνάγκη φίλον εἶναι <u>τὸν συνηδόμενον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ συναλγοῦντα τοῖς λυπηροῖς</u> μὴ διά τι ἕτερον ἀλλὰ δι' ἐκεῖνον).

[49] D.L. 7.116=*SVF* 3.431=LS 65F; Marcus Aurelius 2.5.1; Pseudo-Andronicus, *On Emotions* 6.2=*SVF* 4.432; Cf. Graver 2007, pp. 53–60 and 175–90.

[50] Cf. Brennan 1998, pp. 35–6.

passions, namely, positive feelings and desires for the good of others for their own sake, without the vulnerability of normal human emotions.[51]

Plutarch cries foul to this move. He agrees that benevolence is essential to friendship (*On Having Many Friends* 93F1–2[52] and *On Brotherly Love* 482B4–7[53]), but finds it odd to think that one's desire for the good of others can be disinterested in whether their conditions actually turn out to be good.[54] Benevolence necessarily involves vulnerability. We cannot have "true benevolence" unless we are able to share in the joy and grief of our friends:

[T6] φιλίας δὲ φιλοστοργίαν[55] ἢ φιλανθρωπίας ἔλεον ἢ τὸ συγχαίρειν καὶ συναλγεῖν εὐνοίας ἀληθινῆς οὐδὲ βουλόμενος ἄν τις ἀποσπάσειεν οὐδ' ἀποτήξειεν.

> Not even if someone wished could they separate off or melt away from friendship affection, from humaneness pity, and from genuine benevolence the sharing in joy and grief. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451E4–6)[56]

---

[51] Cf. Irwin 1998, pp. 225–7.

[52] Benevolence is a necessary condition for friendship: "What then is the currency for [buying] friendship? Benevolence and favor accompanied by virtue. There is nothing rarer that nature has than these" (τί οὖν νόμισμα φιλίας; εὔνοια καὶ χάρις μετ' ἀρετῆς, ὧν οὐδὲν ἔχει σπανιώτερον ἡ φύσις).

[53] Benevolence (εὔνοια) serves as the starting-point to friendship (ἀρχὴ τῆς φιλίας). For Plutarch, brothers serve as an early, natural instance of friendship within one's family (*On Brotherly Love* 479C9–D2).

[54] Cf. Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1071B11–C3: "For, if someone were to say that an archer, in aiming, does everything within his power not for the sake of hitting the target, but for the sake of doing all that is within his power, he would seem to draw monstrous and enigma-like conclusions" (ὡς γὰρ εἰ τοξεύοντα φαίη τις οὐχὶ πάντα ποιεῖν τὰ παρ' αὐτὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ βαλεῖν τὸν σκοπὸν ἀλλ' ἕνεκα τοῦ πάντα ποιῆσαι τὰ παρ' αὐτόν, αἰνίγμασιν ὅμοια καὶ τεράστια δόξειεν ἂν περαίνειν). Cf. Railton 1986, p. 14: "To have a desire is, among other things, to care whether or not it is satisfied." While one might suppose that the Stoic notion that doing everything one can to act for the benefit others accounts for appropriate seriousness in the endeavor (cf. Irwin 1998, pp. 232–8), as Brennan 1998 (p. 57, n. 98) points out, seriousness about doing everything one can to fulfill virtuous actions does not translate into a seriousness about the objects of one's virtuous actions: "[W]e cannot simply hand along the object from a nested attitude to the nesting attitude."

[55] Cf. Babut 1969b, p. 171, who argues that φιλοστοργίαν (affection) should be altered in this passage on the grounds that the Stoics would not have regarded it as a passion. *Contra* Babut, see Becchi 1990. Considering the polemical nature of this passage, and that Plutarch considers φιλοστοργία to be an affection, as I argue in Chapter 6 and in §VI below, I find Babut's argument unconvincing. Cf. also Roskam 2011, p. 184.

[56] See also Plutarch, *On Brotherly Love* 483C4–7: "When their father has died, it is, in truth, right more than previously for the brother to cling to the benevolence of his brother, immediately sharing his affection by weeping together and grieving together with him (ἀποθανόντος γε μὴν πατρὸς ἐμφύεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ὀρθῶς ἔχει τῇ εὐνοίᾳ τὸν ἀδελφόν, εὐθὺς μὲν ἐν τῷ συνδακρύειν καὶ συνάχθεσθαι κοινούμενον τὸ φιλόστοργον).

In effect, Plutarch claims that the Stoic idea of benevolence is disingenuous. It purports to include a necessary feature of desiring the good of another *for their sake* (ἕνεκεν ἐκείνου), so that friends are not merely instrumental to one's own happiness,[57] but this definition lacks the interpersonal component of having one's own happiness invested in others. To be connected intimately and genuinely with those we love, Plutarch argues, we must be able to empathize with them and allow their well-being to affect our own. We must be able to *identify* with them in such a way that we share in their successes and failures (Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft* 823A9–B1=[T4]).

Intimacy and empathy in genuine friendships require that we suffer together with friends when they are suffering. When friends are struggling, enduring hardships, and distressed, for instance, we join them in their struggles, hardships, and distress (τὸ συναγωνιᾶν καὶ τὸ συνασχολεῖσθαι καὶ συγκάμνειν, *On Having Many Friends* 95E11–12). When a friend buries someone he loved, we mourn with him (ὁ δὲ θάπτων συμπενθεῖν, *On Having Many Friends* 95C10–11). Our affection is shared in weeping together and grieving together (ἐν τῷ συνδακρύειν καὶ συνάχθεσθαι κοινούμενον τὸ φιλόστοργον, *On Brotherly Love* 483C4–7).[58] The burden of shared suffering, for Plutarch, is part of the bargain of friendship, since, as we will see below, there are many goods that come with friendship that we would not choose to forfeit for the sake of invulnerability.

The Stoics might respond to Plutarch's critique that *our* understanding of what counts as a success or a failure, if it includes anything apart from virtue, is in error. According to their view, pains of the body, deprivation of conventional goods, such as wealth, health, and even

[57] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.2, 1155b31, and Plutarch, *On Envy and Hate* 536E7–F2.
[58] See n. 56 above for the quotation.

other friends, is not what matters for the happiness of the sage and should not matter for anyone else, including our friends. Virtue is the singular object of absolute value, alone brings happiness, and is the sole measure of success. Not even prolonging life contributes to one's happiness, since death and span of life are irrelevant to virtue and happiness.[59] Failure to become virtuous is the only failure that causes grief; all non-sages are equally vicious and equally unhappy.

Plutarch's objection nevertheless cuts deeply into the Stoic notion of friendship, since the condition of others does not affect the sage's own happiness. Even if we grant that virtue alone is all that matters, the virtue of others will, oddly enough, still have no impact on the sage's own happiness. We would think that it would, since virtue is of absolute importance, and all sages are of equal value because of their virtue.[60] Nevertheless, the friend's state of virtue is outside the sage's control and therefore is not part of his own virtue. The sage cannot enjoy his friend's successes anymore than he can take joy in anything else outside his power.[61] The sage's happiness, moreover, just like his virtue, does not come in degrees and cannot be increased or

---

[59] Life seems like an odd thing to include among conventional goods that make no difference to virtue and happiness, since we might assume that one needs to be alive to be virtuous. Yet the Stoics assert that the duration of life makes no difference to its absolute value (Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1039E=*SVF* 3.761=LS 60Q). The value of virtue is not increased by the addition of time (Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1061F=*SVF* 3.54=LS 63I). Cf. D.L. 7.101–3=LS 58A, 7.104–5=*SVF* 3.119=LS 58B, 7.127=LS 61I; Stob. 2.7.7a (p. 79, l. 18–p. 80, l. 13)=LS 58C; Marcus Aurelius 3.7. Cf. Nussbaum 1994, p. 362 and n. 14.

[60] Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1076A=LS 61J. Cf. Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1038C–D.

[61] Cf. Sorabji 2000, p. 51, and Graver 2007, p. 59. Sorabji proposes that one's good-feelings might be affected by observing virtue in one's friends. Here he seems to be relying on the argument of the pleasure that one feels in contemplating the virtue of one's friends in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 9.9 (1169b29–1170a4). But even Sorabji notes that this is problematic given an objection he credits to Tad Brennan: "It may seem to create a further problem if sages rejoice in, and also wish for, good in other people, because that good is not under their control." Graver likewise notes that the desire for another's good seems to contradict the Stoic assertation that virtue and happiness are completely within our control. Graver tries to defend the view, noting that in a few passages (namely, Stob. 2.7.10b–c; Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 4.72; and D.L. 7.114 and 129) a *potential* for virtue might be a cause for a genuine concern for others: "One cannot help but conclude that the rich affective life of the wise is being said to include some concern for other human beings that goes beyond disinterested service to the level of genuine affective involvement." But, this violates the very principles that the Stoics set out, since affective involvement would require vulnerability, and that is exactly what is denied to Stoic good feelings (εὐπάθειαι). The good feelings of the sage are *not* affected by the conditions of other individuals, whether or not sages promote the good of others through their own actions. The sages' concern for others cannot help but remain *disinterested*. The Stoics cannot have their cake and eat it too.

decreased by the recognition of or appreciation of another's virtue.[62] The sage's concern for what happens to others, insofar as it does not affect his own happiness, remains *disinterested*.

Having friends may be good for the Stoics, but that good turns out to be qualified. Their view of friendship is highly revisionary. Whether we have friends or not does not affect our own happiness inasmuch as their presence or absence is outside our control. Their existence, relationship to us, and the state of their soul still ultimately make no difference to our own happiness. Friends categorically fall into the class of preferred indifferents, i.e. things one would prefer to have but which still in no way affect one's own happiness.[63] They may have intrinsic worth, being valuable and choice-worthy in themselves (δι' αὑτά),[64] but for the Stoics that makes no difference to one's happiness, since, once again, the absolute value of virtue is overriding and in a class of its own.[65] Only virtue counts as the real, ultimate good. Even the

---

[62] Cicero, *On Ends* 3.33–4, 3.44, 4.29, 5.7; Seneca, *Letters* 92.17; Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1039C=*SVF* 3.29; D.L. 7.101=*SVF* 3.30.

[63] Cf. Nussbaum 1994, pp. 360–3 and 416–19. Cf. also Irwin 1998, pp. 227–8.

[64] D.L. 7.107=*SVF* 3.135=LS 58m: "Moreover, of preferred indifferents, some are preferred on their own account while others on account of other things, and still others are preferred on their own account and also on account of other things. Good potential, moral progress, and the like are preferred on their own account. Wealth, noble birth, and the like are preferred on account of other things. Strength, good faculties of perception, and fittingness of body are preferred on their own account and on account of other things. Things that are preferred on their own account are so because they are in accordance with nature. Things that are preferred on account of other things are so because they procure not a few things that are useful" (ἔτι τῶν προηγμένων τὰ μὲν δι' αὑτὰ προῆκται, τὰ δὲ δι' ἕτερα, τὰ δὲ καὶ δι' αὑτὰ καὶ δι' ἕτερα. δι' αὑτὰ μὲν εὐφυΐα, προκοπὴ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια· δι' ἕτερα δὲ πλοῦτος, εὐγένεια καὶ τὰ ὅμοια· δι' αὑτὰ δὲ καὶ δι' ἕτερα ἰσχύς, εὐαισθησία, ἀρτιότης. δι' αὑτὰ μέν, ὅτι κατὰ φύσιν ἐστί· δι' ἕτερα δέ, ὅτι περιποιεῖ χρείας οὐκ ὀλίγας); D.L. 7.124.4–8=*SVF* 3.631=LS 67P: "They [the Stoics] claim that a friend is choice-worthy in himself and that having many friends is good" (δι' αὐτόν θ' αἱρετὸν τὸν φίλον ἀποφαίνονται καὶ τὴν πολυφιλίαν ἀγαθόν). Cf. Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1068F, 1076A=*SVF* 3.246=61J; Stob. 2.7.11i (p. 101, l. 21–p. 102, l. 3)=LS 60P. *Pace* Nussbaum 1994, p. 361, the Stoics' denial that indifferents affect our happiness and their denial that friends are of absolute value does not indicate that friends cannot be choice-worthy in themselves and therefore of intrinsic worth. See the following note.

[65] See n. 12 above. Stoics seem to have two different notions of intrinsic value within their ordinal system that fit well with Bradley's (2006) division of Moorean and Kantian notions of intrinsic value. Conventional goods, i.e. preferred indifferents, can be intrinsically valuable insofar as they are "to-be-chosen" for themselves (δι' αὑτά)—the Moorean intrinsically valuable goods, but these belong to a different order from the intrinsic, true good of virtue that is choice-worthy for itself (δι' αὐτήν)—the Kantian intrinsically valuable good. Conventional goods are not worthy of choice *unconditionally* even though they are of intrinsic value, whereas virtue is unconditionally choice-worthy. Consider the good of health that is intrinsically good, but which we would choose not to have if virtue required that we act in such a way that sacrifices health. Health is intrinsically good, but not unconditionally so.

good of friendship is, then, preferable and intrinsically valuable, but ultimately still an "indifferent." If a friend dies, we simply find another; there is nothing peculiar to any friend that their loss should affect our happiness.[66] If circumstances deprive us of friends, they are dispensable. They cannot contribute to our happiness any more than they can depreciate it.

§V Intimacy and the Good of Friendship

For Plutarch, the Stoics empty friendship of all the good that it *adds* to our lives when they remove passions from friendship. Yes, Plutarch concedes, friendship comes at the cost of vulnerability, since it leaves us open to the vicissitudes of fortune as we invest our happiness in others. Friendship is a good that is subject to fortune (ὧν ἔτυχεν ἀγαθῶν, *On Tranquility of Mind* 469D8–E1).[67] Nevertheless, Plutarch argues, it is worth the price. Friendship for Plutarch, as we will see below, is a great good that makes no small difference to our happiness. It is worth the risk of jeopardizing our own insulation from circumstances to avoid cutting ourselves off from true intimacy and shared joy with others. It is also healthy and rewarding to have interpersonal relationships with others, since it is natural and part of the fulfillment of our human nature.

On the Epicurean notion that friendship is choice-worthy in itself, though not itself a virtue (Epicurus, *Vatican Sayings* 23), see Armstrong 2011.

[66] Seneca, *Letters* 9.5; D.L. 7.32–3=LS 67B, 7.121–2=LS 67M, 7.124=*SVF* 3.631=LS 67P. Sages do not form attachments to particular individuals based on their own personal qualities. If a sage were to form a personal attachment to another individual due to something peculiar to that individual, it could jeopardize his invulnerability. Cf. Lesses 1993, p. 73–5: "Sages do not value someone's unique personal attributes. What they do value is the same in each person capable of friendship. Accordingly, genuine friends are relatively interchangeable….For the Stoics, because true friends are replaceable, it is quite literally meant."

[67] Cf. Plutarch, *Solon* 7.1–8. Cf. also Hertzoff 2008.

First, Plutarch holds that our happiness requires virtue, but, unlike the Stoics, he does not believe that our happiness is invulnerable to what is outside our control.[68] Virtue alone is not sufficient to insulate us from misfortunes that impinge upon our happiness nor to account for all of the goods of this life. There are goods besides virtue that, in the right conditions, can contribute to our happiness.

In *On Virtue and Vice*, Plutarch plays off of Zeno's formula that "character is the spring of life from which particular actions flow forth" (ἦθός ἐστι πηγὴ βίου, ἀφ' ἧς αἱ κατὰ μέρος πράξεις ῥέουσι, Stob. 2.7.1 (p. 38, ll. 16–17)=*SVF* 1.203). From Plutarch's partial quotation flows out a conclusion to which Zeno would object:

[T7] τὸ δ' ἡδέως ζῆν καὶ ἱλαρῶς οὐκ ἔξωθέν ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῖς περὶ αὑτὸν πράγμασιν ἡδονὴν καὶ χάριν ὥσπερ ἐκ πηγῆς τοῦ ἤθους προστίθησιν.

> To live pleasantly and with mirth is not derived from what is outside, but, on the contrary, a human adds pleasure and delight to the affairs that surround him, as though from the spring of his character. (Plutarch, *On Virtue and Vice* 100C9–12)

Plutarch takes the notion that one's actions and happiness flow from one's character in a decidedly un-Stoic direction. Plutarch agrees that happiness cannot simply come from fortune, from outside our actions and state of soul (ἔξωθεν). Happiness depends on virtue of character for Plutarch. Virtue is necessary for happiness. We cannot be called happy no matter what good fortunes and circumstances we have, if we are rotten and vicious in soul (Plutarch, *Whether Vice is Sufficient for Unhappiness*).[69] We will use our good fortune badly.[70] For Plutarch, however,

[68] I suspect that this argument against the sufficiency thesis may have played a central role in Plutarch's lost work, *Περὶ τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῖν πρὸς τοὺς Στωικούς* (*On What is Up to Us, Against the Stoics*), no. 154 in the Lamprias Catalogue.
[69] The entirety of this work of Plutarch argues that vice, no matter how great one's good fortunes may be, is sufficient to make one entirely miserable.
[70] Cf. Plutarch *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1048C9–D1.

virtue of character *adds* (προστίθησιν) pleasure and delight to the other parts of one's life.[71] Virtue enhances and makes other objects worthy of enjoyment and increases the degree to which one delights in life and is happy.

Goods apart from one's own virtue, then, can be valuable for one's happiness as part of the virtuous life.[72] Other aspects of one's life can be made good in such a way that they contribute and add to one's happiness. Chief among goods that contribute to happiness is friendship, since it is not just *a* good but is a marvelously great good:

[T8] τόν γε παρὰ τῷ Μενάνδρῳ νεανίσκον ὑπερφυῶς ἐπαινοῦμεν εἰπόντα θαυμαστὸν ὅσον νομίζειν
ἀγαθὸν ἕκαστον, ἂν ἔχῃ φίλου σκιάν.[73]

We have overwhelming praise for the young man in Menander's play for saying how marvelous a good
each individual considers it if he has even the shadow of a friend.
(Plutarch, *On Having Many Friends* 93C5–7)

Everyone, each individual (ἕκαστος) in the quotation from Menander, Plutarch thinks, considers friendship important to one's own life and something that is good-making for life. The hyperbole that even the shadow of a friend is marvelously good gives that sense. The Stoics may fight this intuition, but we all know that a friend is a good that makes no small difference to our own happiness. Friendship is, for Plutarch, "the most pleasant good of all" (πάντων ἥδιστον) and "nothing else brings more delight to us" (οὐδὲν ἄλλο μᾶλλον εὐφραίνει, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 50F12–51A1). The delight of friendship, moreover, is like a blossom

[71] Instead of drawing the conclusion that items in our life that can be used for bad as well as good cannot be good (Plutarch *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1048C9–D1), Plutarch holds that if used by a virtuous person, they can be good. In this, he is not far from the argument in Plato's *Euthydemus* that what makes one happy is an art that is able to make things both useful and good for oneself, though these can also be made bad for oneself (292a4–11).
[72] Cicero attributes this view to Aristotle, Polemo, the Old Academy, and Peripatetics in *On Ends* 2.34, arguing that goods that are not completely within our control, such as the soundness of our bodily parts, senses, and health, are part of the good life when they are enjoyed with virtue. Cf. Cicero, *Lucullus* 131; Stob. 2.7.3b; Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies* 1.20.5–6. Cf. also Sharples 2010, pp. 165–8.
[73] Fr. 3 of Menander's *Epiclerus* in *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta* Kock.

that grows between friends (τὸ εὐφραῖνον ὥσπερ ἐπανθοῦν, 54F1–3),[74] and "the benevolence of being loved and loving…is to be preserved above all else" (τὴν ἐκ τοῦ φιλεῖσθαι καὶ φιλεῖν εὔνοιαν…παντὸς μᾶλλον διασῴζειν ἀναγκαῖον, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102C10–D2).

Friendship is such a great good for Plutarch that he even describes it as though it were a god-given gift that has been blended into human life:

[T9] τῷ βίῳ μείξας τὴν φιλίαν ὁ θεὸς ἅπαντα φαιδρὰ καὶ γλυκέα καὶ προσφιλῆ ταύτης παρούσης καὶ συναπολαυούσης ἐποίησεν.

> By mixing friendship into life, god made everything bright, sweet, and lovely when friendship is present and shares in its enjoyment.
> (Plutarch, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 50A2–5)

Here, Plutarch says much more than that friendship is good in itself to have. Not only does friendship add value to life, since its presence increases our happiness and is productive of other goods,[75] but it *permeates* the whole of life, making the other parts of one's life *better*. The effect of friendship is not only a greater degree of happiness, but an enhancement of one's life as whole.

Again, none of these goods of friendship are available to us unless we are open to sharing our lives with our friends, since shared feeling and vulnerability are central to true friendship. Plutarch writes that the greatest source of joy in friendship is intimacy:

[T10] καὶ μὴν ἀπόλαυσίς ἐστιν ἡ συνήθεια τῆς φιλίας, καὶ τὸ ἥδιστον ἐν τῷ συνεῖναι καὶ συνδιημερεύειν.

> And certainly, intimacy is the enjoyment of friendship and the greatest pleasure is found in living together and spending one's days together.
> (Plutarch, *On Having Many Friends* 94F8–10)

---

[74] Cf. O'Neill 1997, p. 119.

[75] Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.6, 1362b19–20: Among the goods listed are "a friend and friendship: since a friend is choice-worthy in itself and is productive of many goods" (φίλος καὶ φιλία· καὶ γὰρ καθ' αὑτὸν αἱρετὸς ὁ φίλος καὶ ποιητικὸς πολλῶν).

Friends enjoy spending time together and being in the presence of one another's company, but Plutarch pushes the notion of intimate communion much further.

The communion of friendship seeks to make a *union* between friends. Plutarch draws on several metaphors to describe this deep intimacy. "Friendship," he writes, "desires to make friends a unity and mixture that solidifies" (ἡ φιλία βούλεται ποιεῖν ἑνότητα καὶ σύμπηξιν, *On Having Many Friends* 95B1–2). This view has some overlap with Aristotle's notion that friends become like one another in their shared interests, thoughts, virtue, and passions (ὁμοιοπάθεια, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 51B9–C3; ζητοῦσι συνεξομοιοῦν τὰ πάθη, *On Having Many Friends* 97A1–3).[76] But, more than just becoming *similar* to one another in these respects, friends become so closely connected in their sentiments that they form, as it were, one individual. Being put together, they become affixed to one another and harden (συμπήγνυσθαι) into a single combined entity.

Drawing on Aristotle's formula that a friend is "another self" (ἄλλος / ἕτερος αὐτός),[77] Plutarch describes friendships as measured in units of combination:

[T11] τὸ ἄλλον αὐτὸν ἡγεῖσθαι τὸν φίλον καὶ προσαγορεύειν ἑταῖρον ὡς ἕτερον, οὐδέν ἐστιν ἢ μέτρῳ φιλίας τῇ δυάδι χρωμένων.

> To think of a friend as another self and to refer to a friend as one's other [of a pair][78] is nothing other than what is characteristic of those who use a pair as the measure of friendship. (Plutarch, *On Having Many Friends* 93E9–12)

Friends are, as it were, put together under a common yoke of friendship (ζεῦγος φιλίας, *On Having Many Friends* 93E5). This brings out one sense of friendship for Plutarch. We identify with a friend and the good we desire for ourselves is the same good that we desire for them. We

[76] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.3; *Rhetoric* 2.4.
[77] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 9.4, 1166a31–2: ἄλλος αὐτός; 9.9, 1170b6–7: ἕτερος αὐτὸς; *Eudemian Ethics* 7.12, 1245a30: ἄλλος αὐτός.
[78] ἕτερος often indicates one of a party of two.

are not to think of a friend's good as coming at the expense of our own, but rather as accruing to our own sense of good and well-being.

But, Plutarch also envisions this union to be much deeper. Metaphorical descriptions of union are not meant just to frame our thinking so that we are concerned for the good of others for their own sake, just as we are concerned for our own good. Like Aristotle,[79] Plutarch also describes friendship as forming a union between individuals "as though one soul were divided among multiple bodies" (ὥσπερ μᾶς ψυχῆς ἐν πλείοσι διῃρημένης σώμασι, *On Having Many Friends* 96F3–4). We become deeply invested in one another to the point that we become nearly indistinguishable and inseparable in our sense of shared identity. We might say that two separate individuals are reckoned to be one thing because relationships not only are something that is shared, but they take on a life of their own.

Aristotle uses this provocative metaphor of a shared soul, but then draws back from it, arguing that even though it is *as though* friends share a soul and see one another as another self, "no less does a friend desire to be, as it were, a separate self" (ἀλλ' οὐθέν τε ἧττον βούλεται ὥσπερ αὐτὸς διαιρετὸς εἶναι ὁ φίλος, *Eudemian Ethics* 7.12, 1245a34–5). In the *Politics* (2.4, 1262b11–14), Aristotle argues that if we take the metaphor of fusing souls together (συμφῦναι) and union too seriously, as it is presented in Aristophanes' speech in Plato's *Symposium* (192d2–e9), then both or at least one of the two individuals would be obliterated by the union.[80] Becoming something unified would require losing oneself or one's friend in the process.

Plutarch, however, is not so concerned with the problem of lost individuation. Throughout his remarks on intimacy in one's relationship, he presses into the metaphor to bring

[79] Cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* 9.8, 1168b7–8; *Eudemian Ethics* 7.1, 1240b3.
[80] Cf. Price 1989, p. 110.

out the deep connections that are created through shared feelings between friends and lovers.[81] The blending and gluing together of benevolence (ἡ κρᾶσις καὶ κόλλησις εὐνοίας), "occurs in the intimacy that is poured around and then solidifies" (ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ περιχυθείσῃ καὶ παγείσῃ γενέσθαι, *On Having Many Friends* 95B4–6).[82] We become both encompassed and cemented to one another through shared emotions. Friendship bonds us together:

[T12] ἡ μὲν γὰρ συνάγει καὶ συνίστησι καὶ συνέχει καταπυκνοῦσα ταῖς ὁμιλίαις καὶ φιλοφροσύναις.

> For [friendship] brings together, unites, and holds [friends] together, consolidating them through their communion and their friendliness [toward one another].
> (Plutarch, *On Having Many Friends* 95A5–7)

This, for Plutarch, is a good thing. We gain access to benefits beyond our own capacity as an individual, and as we saw above, Plutarch holds that friendship enhances our life, making other aspects of it better (Plutarch, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 50A2–5=[T9]).

In his descriptions of intimacy within a special kind of friendship, that which develops between spouses, Plutarch also argues that intimacy is better (βελτίων) when affections are shared (Sandbach fr. 167).[83] A good marriage seeks totally blending (δι' ὅλων κρᾶσις, *Dialogue on Love* 766F3–5) so that, like two liquids that become indistinguishable as everything becomes shared, lovers also becomes wholly unified (*Advice to Bride and Groom* 142F8–143A6).[84] Drawing on the imagery of the *Symposium*, the goal is "unification and shared nature" (ἡνωμένος καὶ συμφυής, *Advice to Bride and Groom* 142E12–F8), "fusing souls together"

[81] I do not mean to imply that Plutarch takes the metaphor to indicate that souls become metaphysically indistinguishable and their own individual instances become completely obliterated. Instead, Plutarch emphasizes the extent to which we approximate union in our shared interests and passions.
[82] Cf. *On Having Many Friends* 94E2–3.
[83] From the *Letter On Friendliness*=Stob. 4.12.11.
[84] I discuss these passages further in Chapter 3. Cf. *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 426A=*SVF* 2.367, where Plutarch goes through the different types of conjunction, union, and fusion that are attributed to Chrysippus.

(τὰς ψυχὰς συντήκουσι, *Dialogue on Love* 767D5–E2). And, as with other forms of friendship, this deep connection is achieved through genuine benevolence that involves sharing in one another's passions, both in joys at successes, and distress and grief at failures and setbacks.[85]

This intimacy is not available to the Stoics.[86] As Plutarch reveals, the Stoics ironically debar themselves from the great goods of the shared human life in their attempt to harbor and protect happiness. Although the Stoics desire invulnerability to render the happy sage unassailable (*inexpugnabilis*), secure (*tutus*), protected by a fence (*saeptus*) and fortified by walls (*munitus*),[87] Plutarch shows that the Stoic sage only fences himself in, cutting himself off from the goods of human intimacy and the blessings of the shared life of deep connections with others. He walls himself off not only from his own passions, but in so doing, he also cuts himself off from genuine concern for others and the rich emotional life that exists in vulnerable human relationships. He cuts himself off from the many goods of friendship.

For Plutarch, we should not guard against vulnerability in friendship, but instead embrace it as the greatest refuge from the troubles we face in this life:

[T13] οὔτε ναῦς γὰρ ἐπὶ τοσούτους ἕλκεται χειμῶνας εἰς θάλατταν, οὔτε χωρίοις θριγχοὺς καὶ λιμέσι προβάλλουσιν ἕρκη καὶ χώματα τηλικούτους προσδεχόμενοι κινδύνους καὶ τοσούτους, ὅσων ἐπαγγέλλεται φιλία καταφυγὴν καὶ βοήθειαν, ὀρθῶς καὶ βεβαίως ἐξετασθεῖσα.

> For no ship is drawn into the sea against storms so great, nor do men put up bulwarks on land and walls and embankments for harbors in expectation of dangers so vast and so numerable as those for which friendship, surely and securely proven by testing, offers refuge and safety. (Plutarch, *On Having Many Friends* 94C8–D3)

---

[85] *On Moral Virtue* 451E4–6=[T6]; *Precepts of Statecraft* 823A9–B1=[T4]; *On Brotherly Love* 483C4–7 (quoted in n. 56 above). Cf. *Dialogue on Love* 751C–D; Musielak 2011, p. 259.

[86] Stoic authors do not always agree in their views on the role of ἔρως in marriage. Seneca (fragment of *On Marriage* in Haase) denounces erotic passion in marriage and holds that marriage should be strictly for reproduction, while Musonius Rufinus ("On the Goal of Marriage" and "Is Marriage an Impediment to Philosophy?" in Hense), like Plutarch, advocates shared life together (συμβίωσις), but his view is an outlier from the mainline view that passions, insofar as they are errors in belief, excessive impulses, and render one vulnerable, are not part of the virtuous life. Cf. Nussbaum 1994, p. 441, n. 3.

[87] Cicero, *Tusculan Disputation* 5.40–1=LS 63L.

Far from being merely a source of further potential pain and disappointment, friendship provides the best source of comfort and shelter to the hardships of life. Friends even lessen our grief in times of trouble:

[T14] [ἡ φιλία, 49F1] οὐδὲν ἧττον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἡδονὴν ἐπιφέρουσα καὶ χάριν ἢ τῶν κακῶν ἀφαιροῦσα τὰς λύπας καὶ τὰς ἀπορίας παρέπεται.

> [Friendship] attends to us, adding pleasure and grace to the good in our lives no less than it takes away grief and helplessness from the bad.
> (Plutarch, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 49F6–8)

We cannot fully escape troubles and disturbances, since, contrary to the Stoic's claims, we are affected by what happens outside our control. True friends, however, help us weather the storms of life and provide a proven stronghold, the best, in fact, that is available to us.

§VI Friendship, Human Nature, and the Stoic Theory of οἰκείωσις

As we will explore in this section, Plutarch sees the defects of Stoic friendship as symptomatic of a larger problem in the Stoic view of human nature. We need other people to be happy. We also need other people to be fully human. The Stoic view of human nature, insofar as it fails to capture the *necessity* of friendship and the *goods* of friendship, is defective. Their view of friendship is, as Plutarch argues, *contrary* to nature.

As in Aristotle's account, Plutarch believes that we are social and political animals. We would not choose to live alone with all other goods, since it is in our nature to be in communion with other human beings.[88] With this view of the social and political aspects of our nature, Plutarch frames the naturalness of friendship in terms of human need:

[T15] αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ προσδεχομένη καὶ ζητοῦσα φιλίαν καὶ ὁμιλίαν χρεία διδάσκει τὸ

[88] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.1, 1155a5–6; 9.9, 1169b17–19; *Politics* 1.2, 1253a2–9; 3.6, 1278b19; *Eudemian Ethics* 7.10, 1242a22–8. Cf. also *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.5, 1157b19–23. How necessary friendships are for the happy and good life in Aristotle's view is the subject of much debate. See n. 90 below.

> συγγενὲς τιμᾶν καὶ περιέπειν καὶ διαφυλάττειν, ὡς ἀφίλους καὶ ἀμίκτους καὶ μονοτρόπους ζῆν μὴ δυναμένους μηδὲ πεφυκότας.
>
> Our need itself, which welcomes and seeks friendship and companionship, teaches us to honor our relatives and to guard and take care of them, since we are not able and it is not natural for us to live without friends, without communion with others, all alone.
> (Plutarch, *On Brotherly Love* 479C1–4)

For Plutarch, we *need* to be in relationships with others. In fact, Plutarch indicates that it is *impossible* and *unnatural* to live without human friendship. He does not mean that we could not survive apart from other human beings, living a solitary life as a hermit apart from all human contact or as a child raised by wolves. Rather, what he indicates is that such a life would fail to be a truly human life. It would lack the very qualities that make humans what they are. Sociability is built into our very make-up and demanded by human nature.

Throughout much of the discussion of friendship so far, Plutarch's view of friendship aligns well on many points with Aristotle's and appears greatly influenced by it.[89] The question of whether friendship is necessary for happiness in Aristotle's view, however, has been the subject of much debate.[90] Regardless of Aristotle's own position on that question, the message is clear from Plutarch. Friendship is not only a very great good, but also an essential component of

[89] On the prevalence of Aristotle's views on friendship in Plutarch's thought see O'Neill 1997, pp. 112–13.
[90] The question depends on how the following are related to one another and to the notion of self-sufficiency: intellectual virtues, moral virtues, and external goods and friends, whose presence allows for the exercise of moral virtues (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1.8, 1199a31–b4; 7.13, 1154a4; 9.9, 1169b10, 1170a4-11). We also need to consider the extent to which we need friends so that we can contemplate their virtues to understand our own (9.9, 1169b29–1170a4). Adkins 1963 (pp. 44–5) believes that the self-sufficiency of contemplative virtue is impossible and that we will need friends for the good life (cf. Sorabji 2000, pp. 190–1, who holds the same view). Long 1968a sees happiness as dependent on friends for virtuous action. The presence of friendships, moreover, increases the degree to which one is happy. For Annas 1977 (p. 550), our life would be lacking if we could not contemplate the virtues of a friend. Ackrill 1980 argues that Aristotle makes conflicting claims: (A) friends are intrinsic goods that are necessary constituents of happiness and (B) happiness of contemplation is self-sufficient. In response to Ackrill, Kraut 1989 (esp. pp. 267–311) argues that the exercise of intellectual virtues constitutes a higher happiness as opposed to the inclusion of friendship in the exercise of moral virtues, which is a second-best kind of happiness. Sherman 1987 (pp. 592–5) argues that happiness must include friends as part of one's extended self. Nussbaum 1994 (pp. 93–6) and Oele 2012 (pp. 53–5) hold that happiness for Aristotle is vulnerable to the loss of external goods, including loved ones and friends, while Mansini 1998 (p. 416) believes that friendship for Aristotle is a "sort of surplus, a natural grace and enhancement relative to the possession of happiness."

humanity that enhances life and is not something we would choose to live without.[91] Friendship enriches life when it is present.[92]

The Stoics nod in the direction of the naturalness of human friendship with their foundational account of natural "appropriation" / "identification" (οἰκείωσις).[93] The Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις purports to explain an ever-expanding consciousness of one's place in the universe and the forging of relationships, leading up to justice in society.[94] How well the Stoics succeed in rooting human relationships and our concern for others in their account of our earliest and developing natural impulses, however, is questionable.[95]

---

[91] Cf. Plutarch, *On Having Many Friends* 95D1–2. This seems to be the position staked out in Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.1, 1155a5–6; 9.9, 1169b17–19, but the matter is complicated by other points in Aristotle's corpus, for which see the previous note.

[92] This brings Plutarch's position in close alignment with Mansini's (1998, p. 416) view of Aristotelian friendship: "[T]here is a sort of addition to one's excellence and happiness, and one that increases the enjoyment thereof" (a continuation of the quotation in n. 90 above).

[93] In its etymology, the term is built off of οἰκειόω, bringing with it connotations associated with what *belongs* in one's household (οἶκος), what *belongs* to oneself (οἰκεῖον), or even the intimacy (οἰκειότης) found in friendship or marriage. The terminology reflects both a sense of ownership and affective disposition, a favorable attitude toward what is one's own (οἰκεῖον). Cf. Long and Sedley 1987, vol. 1, pp. 350–5; Blundell 1990, p. 221; Sorabji 1993, p. 122ff; *id*. 2006, p. 104. Long and Sedley prefer the translation of "appropriation," and Inwood, "orientation" (1985, pp. 184–5). I prefer the translation of "identification," as it is used in Boys-Stones 2014, since I think it captures more than a sense of ownership or orientation in how we view and relate to other individuals, which the Stoic account purports to capture.

As a note on οἰκειότης, I do not intend to make a connection between Stoic οἰκείωσις and Theophrastus's use of the concept of οἰκειότης (for a discussion on this topic see Brink 1955 and Pembroke 1971, pp. 132–7). I merely intend to show the range of connotations we should have in mind for οἰκείωσις. I hope that the connotations of "intimacy" will help bring out the ironic consequence of the theory based on Plutarch's criticisms of the impersonal nature of Stoic οἰκείωσις.

[94] Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1038B5–10=*SVF* 3.179 and 2.724=LS 57E; *id*. *On the Great Fortune or Virtue of Alexander* 1, 329A–B=*SVF* 1.262=LS 67A; Cicero, *On Ends* 3.66–8; Stob. 4.27.23 (p. 671, l. 7–p. 673, l.11). Stoic sources often speak of justice as a virtue peculiar to distribution toward other people (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 440E–441D=LS61B; *id*., *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1034C–E=LS 61C; cf. Stob. 2.7.5b5 (p. 63, ll.6–24)=*SVF* 3.280=LS 61D). I suggest that we understand by this something akin to Aristotle's justice in the expanded sense (*Nicomachean Ethics* 5.1), which ranges over all our relations toward other people. Cf. Taylor and Wolfram 1968; Sorabji 1993, p. 118; Sellars 2006, p. 131.

[95] The foundational account of Stoic οἰκείωσις is a type of cradle argument that draws on observable behavior of children in particular, and often on the behavior of non-human animals also, to explain natural impulses of human nature that fit with one's own view of human nature and lead to one's own theory of ethics. For a detailed discussion on cradle arguments, their purports as foundational accounts, and their shortcomings, see Brunschwig 1986. Cf. also Annas 1993, pp. 133–220: arguments from nature were used in all ancient ethical arguments. Cf. also Klein 2016.

According to the account of Stoic οἰκείωσις presented in Cicero's *On Ends* (3.63), for instance, human community is natural. We feel kinship and belonging to one another, motivated by a natural drive to associate and identify with actions and items that are appropriate to our nature, including our friends.[96] Plutarch himself describes an expansion of affection (φιλοστοργία) for others that begins with parental love for offspring. This account of expanding identification is often taken to be part of the Stoic account of οἰκείωσις and to describe a natural progression of identification that begins from social bonds between parents and offspring and eventually includes other individuals in ever-expanding spheres of concern.[97] Hierocles' account of οἰκείωσις gives some credence to this view, since it describes parents' affectionate identification with their offspring (στερκτικῶς οἰκειοῦσθαι) as an example of other-regarding concern,[98] and similarly draws expanding circles of concern for others around the individual.[99]

How this account of social bonding, which seems to be derived from affectionate impulses in human nature, fits together with another account of Stoic οἰκείωσις has been the subject of considerable attention and debate.[100] On the face of it, the other account, as found in what Brad Inwood calls the "Basic Text" (D.L. 7.85–6),[101] appear to describe one's self-

[96] Cf. Cicero, *On Ends* 1.12, 3.62–8=LS 57F. Cf. also D.L. 7.85=*SVF* 3.178=LS 57A; Cicero, *On Ends* 3.16–17.
[97] *On Affection for Offspring* 495C, *On the Cleverness of Animals* 962A–B. I discuss these passages in Chapter 6.
[98] *Elements of Ethics* 9.3–10; 11.14–18=LS 57D. The text of *Elements of Ethics* is unfortunately fragmentary, the first three-hundred lines or so surviving in a papyrus fragment (which was edited by von Arnim and printed in *Hierokles, Ethische Elementarlehre (Papyrus 9780): Nebst den bei Stobäus erhaltenen ethischen Exzerpten aus Hierokles*, Berlin: Weidmann, 1906; Bastianini and Long 1992a is a newer critical edition and Bastianini and Long 1992b provides corrections and further discussion to the 1992a edition) with other quotations from the text preserved in Stobaeus. Cf. Inwood 1984, who has an extended discussion on the Hierocles papyrus, and Ramelli 2009.
[99] Stob. 4.27.23 (p. 671, l. 7–p. 673, l.11), which is an extended quotation from later portions of Hierocles' *Elements of Ethics*.
[100] See nn. 104–6 below.
[101] Cf. Inwood 1985, pp. 186–215.

regarding motivations and activities from birth, not one's concern for others.[102] It is unclear how friendship and human relationships follow from human nature in the Basic Text's account of οἰκείωσις.[103]

This has led one camp of modern interpreters to suppose that the Stoics proposed two different, but complementary, forms of οἰκείωσις.[104] One form, presented in the Basic Text, accounts for self-regarding interests. Interpreters often refer to this as "personal οἰκείωσις." A second form, which relies on the descriptions of social bonding and affection, accounts for other-regarding interests and concerns and helps to explain the sociability of human nature. This second form is called "social οἰκείωσις."[105]

Another camp of interpreters believes that there is only one account of Stoic οἰκείωσις.[106] They see within it, however, a radical break between pre-rational development and the formation of ethical concerns at the advent of reason in humans. On this view, the other-regarding concerns

[102] The Basic Text is corroborated with slight variation in Origen, *On Principles* 3.1.2–3=*SVF* 2.988=LS 53A; Cicero, *On ends* 3.16–17; Hierocles, *Elements of Ethics* 1.5–33, 2.1–3, 4.38–53=LS 53B, 4.43–5, 6.50–53; Seneca, *Letters* 121.6–15=LS 57B.

[103] Hierocles attests to affection in parts of his account of οἰκείωσις. In some ways, Hierocles seems to combine elements of the Basic Text with what I call the "Affection Account" that we have from Cicero and Plutarch. Unfortunately, as Inwood (1983, p. 197; 1984, pp. 180–3) notes, if Hierocles explained the logical connections between these different accounts, we are missing it in the fragmentary remains of his work

[104] See Brink 1955; Pembroke 1971; Striker 1983; Görgemanns 1983; Inwood 1983, 1985; Blundell 1990; Frede 1999. For more on the history of this interpretation see Klein 2016, p. 157.

[105] This distinction of two forms of οἰκείωσις is not present in our sources, nor are the labels of "personal οἰκείωσις" and "social οἰκείωσις."

[106] See White 1979; Striker 1983; Long 1996a, pp. 172–7; Frede 1999; Radice 2000, p. 206; Doyle 2012; Reydams-Schils 2017, pp. 145–6; For more on the history of this interpretation see Klein 2016, pp. 156 and 158. For the notion that other-regarding motivations must be rooted in reason cf. Korsgaard 1998, p. 54: "If you follow the tendency of self-love unreflectively, not asking yourself why it matters that you should get what you want, your state tends to degenerate into the state Kant calls 'self-conceit,' in which you act as if it mattered that you get what you want just because you are you. But if you identify yourself with your humanity or power of rational choice, the principle of treating humanity in your own person and that of any other as an end in itself more or less directly follows." Something along these lines seems to be assumed within the radical break interpretation.

of human social life are derived from the rational nature of humans, but this rational nature develops over time.[107]

My own view is that the recent work by Jacob Klein provides the most charitable interpretation of Stoic οἰκείωσις to date, but that Plutarch's criticisms of the Stoic view of human nature and its failure to lead to genuine friendship still apply. On Klein's view, only one form of οἰκείωσις is required to explain motivations and activities from life's inception through to the perfection of human nature with human relationships. The Basic Text is that account, but it often is misunderstood as describing self-preservation as the primary motivation of creatures.[108] Once we understand that it describes the goal of being consistent with one's own nature and the impulse to perfect it, the social aspects of human obligations and concern flow from human natural impulses that are present from birth.[109] There is no radical break in the way that natural impulses operate and govern human behavior from pre-rational to rational life.[110]

---

[107] Aetius 4.11.1–4=*SVF* 2.83=LS 39E; D.L. 7.55–6=LS 33H. Cf. Sorabji 1993, pp. 115–16.

[108] Cf. Inwood 1985, p. 184: "The starting-point of all value is the desire of all animals, including humans, for self-preservation." Cf. also Görgemanns 1983, p. 165. Cf. also Railton 1984, p. 168: "Distracted by the picture of a hypothetical, presocial individual, philosophers have found it very easy to assume, wrongly, that in the actual world concern for oneself and one's goals is quite automatic, needing no outside support, while a direct concern for others is inevitably problematic, needing some further rationale." Interpreters of Stoic οἰκείωσις often assume some form of pre-social individual that automatically issues in a concern for self and believe they find confirmation of this view in their construal of the primary impulse of an animal as aimed at self-preservation.

[109] Cf. Klein 2016. In short, Klein's argument is that the primary identification of a creature to itself is its identification with its own constitution, which is the condition of a creature's commanding-faculty (Seneca, *Letters* 121.10=*SVF* 3.184=LS 29F; Iamblichus, *On the Soul* (Stob. 1.49.33 (p. 368, ll. 12–20))=LS 53K; Philo, *Allegories of the Laws* 1.30=*SVF* 2.844=LS 53P). Creatures regulate their activity and motivations in accordance with what befits their own constitution and nature, i.e. according to what it means for them to be the kind of creatures they are at their stage of development (D.L. 7.107=*SVF* 3.493=LS 59C; cf. Stob. 2.7.8 (p. 85, l. 13–p. 86, l. 4)=*SVF* 3.494=LS 59B; D.L. 7.107–9=*SVF* 3.494, 3.495=LS 59C and 59E; Seneca, *Letters* 121.6–15=LS 57B). These activities include not only self-regarding acts that are aimed at self-preservation, but also acts that are self-sacrificing and other-regarding that may be appropriate in certain circumstances and according to certain relationships (D.L. 7.107–8=*SVF* 3.494=LS 59C; D.L. 7.109=*SVF* 3.496=LS 59E; Stob. 2.7.8 (p. 85, l. 13–p. 86, l. 4)=*SVF* 3.494=LS 59B; cf. Engberg-Pedersen 1986, pp. 180–2).

[110] Cf. Klein 2016, p. 159: "To hold that human motivation undergoes a radical shift in the ideal course of development seems to undercut the dialectical point of the οἰκείωσις account."

This interpretation accounts for how human relationships develop from the natural impulses of human nature; we form social bonds with others and have obligations to others based on what is appropriate to human nature. So, Plutarch might grant to the Stoics that friendship appears to be natural to humans in their theory, since it is natural for humans to seek out friendships and join human communities according to their view. These relationships, as with the Stoics' friends themselves, may even have value as items that it is preferable for one to pursue and try to maintain according to nature. Nevertheless, the Stoic conception of human sociability still only accounts for the *appearance* of friendships and a disingenuous form of concern for others, since it lacks vulnerability and the intimacy of a shared emotional life. The sage can act to fulfill natural obligations to friends and family, but he cannot be affected by their well-being.

Plutarch's criticisms reveal that there is something fundamentally wrong with the Stoics' view of human nature and their theory of ethical development. Their theory of οἰκείωσις leads to an ironic outcome. The sage becomes *alienated* from his friends and his own passionate nature as a consequence of a theory that purports to describe his *appropriation* (οἰκείωσις) of all aspects of his life, including his relationships with others.[111] The Stoic sage must remove himself from the very passions that would enable him to identify with others in intimacy (οἰκειότης). He can only imitate the actions that are natural to friendship without feeling genuine benevolence and concern for others in his orientation to other human beings.

The Stoic account also fails to count friendships and human social life as necessary constituents of one's happiness. In the Stoic view, the sage can be just as human without human

[111] See n. 2 above. Cf. Cicero, *On Ends* 3.63: "From this [impulse to identify with what is one's own] is born a shared attraction of humans among other humans, so that a human, insofar as he is human, ought not to appear alienated from another" (*ex hoc nascitur ut etiam communis hominum inter homines naturalis sit commendatio, ut oporteat hominem ab homine ob id ipsum quod homo sit non alienum videri*).

society as with it.[112] As we have already seen above, the absence of friends and other human relations altogether, if it is caused by anything outside one's control, will make no difference to the sage's virtue and happiness. The solitary hermit can be just as happy as the sage in the city of the virtuous.[113]

One might object that I have left out affection, which seems to be the starting-point for human relationships in the account of οἰκείωσις presented by Plutarch and in parts of Cicero's *On Ends*.[114] Affection would seem to admit some intimacy and passionate concern for others in the Stoic account. So, does that not address and answer Plutarch's criticisms?

This brings us back to a question I raised earlier: How does the account that begins with affection fit with the account represented by the Basic Text? My answer is that it does not. Since passions are instances of irrationality for the Stoics and because passions do not fit with the Stoic goal of invulnerability, I doubt that this "Affection Account" is an original formulation of the Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις.[115] My position would require a much longer argument, which is outside the scope of this chapter.[116] Let it suffice for me to point out that Klein's interpretation,

---

[112] Seneca, *Letters* 9.2–5.

[113] Cf. Seneca, *On Leisure* 4.1=LS 67K; Arius Didymus (Eusebius, *Evangelical Preparation* 15.15.3–5=*SVF* 2.528=LS 67L; cf. Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1068F).

[114] This particular section of Cicero's *On Ends* 3 (62–8=LS 57F), which many have drawn upon for evidence of social οἰκείωσις, is quite different from the other descriptions we have elsewhere in the book, such as 3.16–22, which are more in keeping with the Basic Text account. On Cicero's distortions in his presentation of Stoic οἰκείωσις compared to the Basic Text and other sources see Inwood 1985, pp. 218–23.

[115] There is some evidence that the Stoics would consider affection a good feeling (εὐπάθεια) and therefore not a passion, since φιλοστοργία is closely tied to, if not identical with, εὐμενία ("continuing benevolence"), a species of benevolence (εὔνοια) according to Pseudo-Andronicus, *On Emotions* 6.2=*SVF* 4.432. See Engberg-Pedersen 1998, p. 332 with citations *ad loc*. Yet, if that is the case, φιλοστοργία cannot belong to non-sages and cannot be foundational to social bonding from the beginning of life, since only the sage, who is perfected in his nature, can have εὐπάθειαι (see n. 50 above). Nor can it be the starting-point for affection between non-human animals. If affection is a passion, as it seems to be in Epictetus (*Discourses* 1.23.5), then, it is once again objectionable to think that it fits into the pattern of ethical development. Cf. Sorabji 1993, pp. 122–3; 2000, pp. 183–4.

[116] My own view is that the Affection Account arose due to perceived deficiencies of the Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις. While the interpretation of Klein 2016 leaves the search for a supplementary or secondary account of Stoic οἰκείωσις unmotivated, I take it that many interpreters of the theory nonetheless found the connection between self-regarding and other-regarding motivations difficult to discern in the theory. Ancient critics of the Stoics, just like

though he does not himself note it, reveals that this Affection Account adds nothing essential to the Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις. The Basic Text, which does not incorporate passions or affection felt between parents and offspring as a foundation for social behavior, already sufficiently explains how self-regarding and other-regarding motivations and actions in the Stoic theory of ethics flow from the Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις. That account, moreover, is consistent with the Stoic end of passionless invulnerability.

As I will argue in Chapter 6, the Affection Account that we find in Plutarch's works fits more with his own view of human nature and with his idea that passions can serve as seeds (σπέρματα) and starting-points (ἀρχαί) for virtues. Affection in particular establishes a pattern of ever-expanding social bonds that lead to up to the fruit of justice. Plutarch, then, *appropriates*, as it were, a form of οἰκείωσις theory, but modifies it so that it incorporates genuine concern for others through shared emotional vulnerability and intimacy.

§VII Stoic Invulnerability and Self-Mutilation

Plutarch thinks that the Stoics have a deeply flawed understanding of human nature. The goal of Stoic invulnerability requires the sacrifice of genuine interpersonal relationships, which, for Plutarch are necessary for the fulfillment of human nature. In addition to the toll that the Stoic goal takes on friendship, Plutarch argues that even *attempting* to achieve Stoic invulnerability comes at a cost to our own nature:

---

modern interpreters, felt that the Stoics must have had some argument for the foundations of human sociability apart from what appears to be the impulse toward self-preservation. Looking at the many examples of other-regarding behavior that Chrysippus drew upon, such as mutual relations between the pea-crab and pinna-mollusk, which features in every book of Chrysippus, apparently (Plutarch, *On the Cleverness of Animals* 980A–B), and Chrysippus' use of examples of parental protection and nurturing of offspring (Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1038B5–10=*SVF* 3.179 and 2.724=LS 57E), ancient authors mistook these examples as evidence that the foundation of other-regarding concerns begins with a natural affection for offspring. A new form of οἰκείωσις emerged, which was not in keeping with the original theory, but seemed to provide some foundation for other-regarding concerns and behavior.

[T16] τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀλγεῖν καὶ δάκνεσθαι τελευτήσαντος υἱοῦ φυσικὴν ἔχει τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς λύπης, καὶ οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῖν. οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε συμφέρομαι τοῖς ὑμνοῦσι τὴν ἄγριον καὶ σκληρὰν ἀπάθειαν, ἔξω καὶ τοῦ δυνατοῦ καὶ τοῦ συμφέροντος οὖσαν...τὸ γὰρ ἀνώδυνον τοῦτ' οὐκ ἄνευ μεγάλων ἐγγίγνεται μισθῶν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· τεθηριῶσθαι γὰρ εἰκὸς ἐκεῖ μὲν σῶμα τοιοῦτον ἐνταῦθα δὲ ψυχήν.

Therefore, to feel pain and the gnawing bites of pain when one's son dies has a source of grief that is natural and outside our control. For I, for my own part, cannot agree with those [the Stoics] who sing hymns of praise to that cruel and callous lack of feeling, which is both outside the realm of possibility and not beneficial.… For this insensitivity to pain comes about in a human only at a great expense; for it is the body, in the former case, which has been brutalized, but in the latter case, the soul.

(Plutarch, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102C5–E1)[117]

Becoming entirely void of passions is not possible for Plutarch (ἔξω καὶ τοῦ δυνατοῦ).[118] As he writes here and elsewhere, it also would not be beneficial (ἔξω…τοῦ συμφέροντος).[119] We already have seen some of the benefits of human intimacy made possible through passionate connections with others. But even more alarming is Plutarch's remark that even *attempting* to render ourselves free from passions is dangerous. We run the risk of harming our own nature. Contrary to the Stoic view, invulnerability is not brought about by a natural process of pursing the end-goal of perfect rationality. It is an ascetic ideal brought about by lacerating and marring our human sensibilities. It requires a process of *self-mutilation*.[120]

Beyond the self-denial we see in the Stoic approach to friendship, where the sage holds back from investing his own sense of happiness in the well-being of others, fortifying himself from contingent circumstances and what is outside his control, Plutarch argues that a passionless

---

[117] I follow Hani 2003, pp. 3–12, and Babbitt 1928, who lays out his argument in the introduction to the Loeb edition of *Consolation to Apollonius* (pp. 105–7), in considering this a genuine work of Plutarch. For discussion of scholarly positions on the authenticity of this work see Hani 2003, pp. 3–4, n. 1. Cf. Babut 1975. Cf. also Fitzgerald 2008a, p. 20, n. 43.

[118] See the following note.

[119] Cf. Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 443C9–10: The project of completely eradicating passions is impossible and not better than having them (τὸ πάθος ἐξαιρεῖν παντάπασιν…οὔτε δυνατόν οὔτ' ἄμεινον).

[120] Cf. Striker 1991, p. 71: "[W]e ought to reject [the Stoics'] 'freedom from emotion' on the ground that it makes us indifferent to things we ought to appreciate. Far from being a necessary condition of virtue, Stoic *apatheia* actually seems to be incompatible with it."

state (ἀπάθεια) of invulnerability would not exemplify the perfection of human nature, but would be proof of its *perversion*. If invulnerability is the Stoic goal, Plutarch believes that it comes at too high a price. It demands not only our persons, but also our *personhood*.

Lactantius, writing over two centuries later, comes to much the same conclusion. He believes that the Stoic goal of invulnerability amounts to madness and, as it were, the castration of our nature:

[T17] *falsae virtutis specie capti misericordiam de homine sustulerunt et dum volunt sanare vitia, auxerunt. et cum idem plerumque fateantur societatis humanae communionem esse retinendam, ab ea plane se ipsos inhumanae virtutis suae rigore dissociant…. Stoici ergo furiosi, qui ea non temperant, sed abscidunt rebus que natura insitis castrare hominem quodammodo volunt.*

> Deceived by the appearance of false virtue, they [the Stoics] removed sympathy from human nature; while they desired to heal vices, they caused them to increase; and although these same people often claim that being part of human society is something we should maintain, they clearly dissociate themselves from it because of the severity of their inhuman virtue…. The Stoics therefore are insane since they do not moderate these [passions] but amputate them and desire somehow to castrate a human being, removing things that are implanted within his nature.
>
> (Lactantius, *Divine Institutes* 6.10.11 and 6.15.2)[121]

The forfeiture of genuine friendship due to, as Lactantius calls it, inhuman virtue (*inhumana virtus*) is only brought about by self-mutilation. With the vivid metaphor of castration, Lactantius indicates that we cut off not only part of ourselves, but the part that is itself productive. The emasculation of virtue, with perhaps an ironic twist on the etymological root of *virtus*, "manliness," hinders the goods of human nature, including friendship and community, from proceeding from our nature.

Interestingly, this angle of attack on Stoic ethics is rare among the ancients. Plutarch stands out in the ancient world in his sensitivity to this kind of concern in his criticism of Stoic

[121] Cf. Irwin 1998, p. 220.

value and ethics. More than others of his time, he focuses on the loss of interpersonal relationships.[122] From the evidence we have, Academic critics and Theophrastus tended to focus on problems of personal happiness as it concerns Stoic invulnerability. They might ask, "Wouldn't the sage being tortured on the rack be at least a *little* happier if he weren't on the rack?"[123] Given the Stoic view that virtue and happiness do not come in degrees, they deny that the sage's happiness would be affected in any way by circumstances outside his control, including torture.[124]

Plutarch, followed later by Lactantius, strikes a deeper blow on a central question of ethics, both ancient and modern: how are we to account for and capture genuine care for others in our ethics?[125] For Plutarch, passions are the key. Benevolence and shared emotions are necessary components of friendship. They are proof of friends' concern for each other. They also draw us together into a union that is part of the fulfillment of human nature and a great part of the good life.

The Stoics might argue that the sage will give the *appearance* of concern for others, shuddering and growing pale at the loss of a child, having the initial bites of passion without

---

[122] Cf. Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.71, who briefly mentions the problem, but does not exploit the issue as Plutarch does.
[123] Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 5.23-5; 73–83. Cf. D.L. 10.118; Cicero, *Academica* 1.33.
[124] *SVF* 3.586; D.L. 10.118=LS 22Q.
[125] The problem of having virtue as a goal within an *objective* ethical system is that it seems to be in tension with our *subjective* perspectives and sentiments. Our own subjective views and concerns for others nonetheless appear highly relevant to our conception of genuine concern for others as a human individual. As Kolodny 2003 argues, ethics as an objective enterprise risks losing sight and focus on personal qualities that we, in our own relationships, consider important to our motivations and concern for other individuals. The focus on being virtuous, or doing what is ethical, threatens to subordinate our actions and attitudes toward others to the goal of being virtuous and ethical. Cf. also Railton 1984, p. 165: "Morality may be conceived of as in essence selfless, impartial, impersonal. To act morally is to subordinate the self and all contingencies concerning the self's relations with others or the world to a set of imperatives binding on us solely as rational beings" and *ibid,* p. 149: "Doesn't the insistence that there is an abstract and uniform goal lying behind all of our ends [including friendship] bespeak an alienation from these particular ends?"

assenting to them.[126] They might also argue that the sage is serious in his endeavor to perform all of his actions for others *as if* they were of ultimate value.[127] He always does all that is in his power to act appropriately in every situation, including those that involve other people. This is the kind of defense we find in both ancient and modern apologists for the Stoics.[128]

This defense, however, fails to hold up against Plutarch's criticisms. Even if the sage has the appearance of passions, the bites and physical symptoms, he cannot assent to them. His emotions and appearance of shared interest and concern are no less disingenuous. His goal is, in fact, to achieve invulnerability and no longer experience any of the symptoms of passions.

Giving merely the appearance of passions, moreover, is characteristic of deception and is the mark of a flatterer, Plutarch argues, not of a friend:

---

[126] Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights* 19.1.17–18; Plutarch, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102C5–E1=[T16]; Augustine, *City of God* 9.4; Cf. Irwin, 1998, pp. 226–38.

[127] I am supposing that a Stoic might draw this point from Chrysippus' defense of the sage's serious endeavor in other appropriate actions: "And Chrysippus, again, in his work on *Rhetoric* writes that the wise man will so speak in public discourse and so engage in politics *as if* wealth, public reputation, and health were good things" (Χρύσιππος δὲ πάλιν ἐν τῷ περὶ Ῥητορικῆς γράφων οὕτω ῥητορεύσειν καὶ πολιτεύσεσθαι τὸν σοφόν, ὡς καὶ τοῦ πλούτου ὄντος ἀγαθοῦ καὶ τῆς δόξης καὶ τῆς ὑγιείας, Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1034B=*SVF* 3.698=LS 66B). The sage will act virtuously, and that will involve a seriousness in performing the actions fitting for him in his public service, treating the ends of his endeavors *as if* they are good things, though they really are indifferent to virtue, happiness, and absolute value. In the same way, the sage will act *as if* the health and life of his friend are good things, and *as if* his friend's well-being were important to his own happiness, though it is not. Cf. Sorabji 2000, p. 185: "The talk of indifference and reservation is not an advocacy of being slack, but of eschewing disappointment if you fail."

[128] Irwin (1998, pp. 226–38) makes this very defense, except that he does not bring up the treatment of others or indifferent items *as if* they were of value as I do in the preceding note. Cf. Dillon 1983 and Karamanolis 2006 (pp. 119–20), who argue that εὐπάθειαι bring the Stoic view close to Aristotle's notion of moderating passions and argue that Plutarch is thus wrong in his criticisms of Stoic ἀπάθεια. Cf. also Inwood 1985, pp. 178 and 180. Graver (2007, pp. 182–4) defends Stoic friendship by arguing that we ought to align ourselves with their theory of value. She also draws upon Seneca, *Letters* 9, where the Stoic sage will be oriented toward a friend as he is toward his own limbs: "[I]t is as intimate as one's attachment to one's own body" (p. 183), but, as she notes on the previous page, one's own limbs are merely preferable but not necessary for one's happiness (Seneca, *Letters* 9.4). For a defense of the appreciation of friends in the sage's εὐπάθειαι, as argued for by Sorabji (2000, p. 51), see the discussion in n. 61 above. Sorabji, however, thinks that the Stoic rejection of emotion and the value of the class of indifferents "belong to the less acceptable side of Stoicism" (p. 181). Having and experiencing emotions, for Sorabji, are part of what it means to be human (p. 189).

For the ancient argument see Augustine, *City of God* 9.4–5: So long as the Stoic sage experiences the bites and physical symptoms of emotions, what difference does it make if they call them indifferents, so long as they *value* them in the same way? As we have seen above, the Stoics *do not* value them in the same way. Cf. also Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 2.30, 5.32, 5.120; *On Ends* 3.41, 4.20, 5.16–20.

[T18] ὄψεται γὰρ αὐτὸν… οὐδ’ ἴδιον οὐδ’ οἰκείῳ πάθει φιλοῦντα καὶ μισοῦντα καὶ χαίροντα καὶ λυπούμενον, ἀλλὰ δίκην κατόπτρου παθῶν ὀθνείων καὶ βίων καὶ κινημάτων εἰκόνας ἀναδεχόμενον.

> For one will observe that he [the flatterer]…does not belong to himself, nor does he love, hate, feel joy, or grief with his own passion, but instead, like a mirror he takes upon himself the images of passions, ways of life, and motions that are alien to him.
> (Plutarch, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 53A1–5)

Such a person is alien to himself (οὐδ’ ἴδιον) and alienated from his own passions and cannot identify with them; his passion is not his own (οὐ οἰκεῖον πάθος). He cannot be a friend to others, since he is not even in ownership of himself. He has lost not only the possibility of true friendship but has lost himself somehow in the process.

Against Plutarch’s criticisms of Stoic invulnerability, the sage fares no better. Considering equality with god within his grasp and trying to imitate divine invulnerability, the sage becomes something less than human. His friendships become a mere imitation of human concern as though others really mattered to his own happiness, but for him, they do not.

***

Plutarch believes that the Stoics sacrifice too much in their pursuit of the impossible. We cannot rid ourselves entirely of passions, since they are essential features of our nature. We cannot give up vulnerability in our relationships, since friendship is a constituent of the full human life. Nor should we. Instead of fighting against human nature and the human condition, Plutarch believes that we should fully embrace all of the good aspects of our passions and the emotional intimacy that they make possible. But, we will need a better understanding of human passions than what the Stoics offer us.

CHAPTER 2

Grief and Moderating Passions: Plutarch Against Plato?

In the last chapter we explored Plutarch's criticisms against Stoic invulnerability. As we will explore in this chapter, Plato's *Republic* seems to fall into the cross-hairs of Plutarch's attack on invulnerability, especially with the argument that grief should be suppressed as far as is possible; grief, Socrates argues, is not useful and is a hindrance to our rational life (§I). Plutarch does not agree with this approach to grief. As is the case for many other passions, it is natural to feel grief and, in fact, sometimes useful (§II).

Certain passages in Plato's *Timaeus*, *Republic*, and *Phaedo* also seem to present the presence of passions as part of a non-ideal condition of the human soul. Human nature, according to these passages, is essentially rational, and the passions and passionate parts of the soul are necessary evils due to embodiment. They are sources of pollution and error, and we should try to nullify their influence in our lives as far as we are able. Other passages in Plato's dialogues, however, seem to present a more positive evaluation of passions and their role in the moral life. The message on what we ought do with our passions is thus somewhat ambiguous in Plato's dialogues (§III).

In contrast with the passionless ideal of an essentially rational nature, Plutarch affirms the embodied condition of human nature and the positive contributions that passions make to the virtuous life. Passions are natural and can, in fact, be useful (§IV). Their usefulness is evident especially as constituents of moral virtue. Plutarch defines moral virtue as a harmonious blending

of passions and reason, which brings passions into moderate states between excess and deficiency (§V). He also draws upon the medical analogy of bodily humors to argue that passions, like humors, are not in themselves excessive diseases of the soul, but when they are imbalanced and immoderate, they are part of a diseased state of the soul (§VI).

The formulation and conception of moral virtue that Plutarch presents harmonizes both Platonic and Aristotelian notions of virtue. Some have thought, however, that Plutarch is essentially Aristotelian in his ethical philosophy. As I argue in the final section (§VII), Plutarch would not see his own view as a departure from Platonic philosophy to Aristotelianism, but instead as an explication of Platonic moral philosophy that is part of a unified and living Platonic tradition, which includes Aristotle as a member. Further, Plutarch argues that one's own theory must fit reality; we cannot force reality to fit our theories, suppositions, or the dogmas passed down through tradition, no matter their provenance. Generally, Plato came to the best views, but even Aristotle in his more systematic formulation of moral virtue may present a better explication of the view that fits best with Plato's philosophy overall and, more importantly, with reality itself.

§I Plato on Eliminating Grief

In a handful of passages throughout the *Republic*, based on terminology if nothing else, it appears that Plato anticipates Aristotle's view that moral virtue involves the moderation of passions, not their elimination.[1] Socrates, for instance, remarks that desires (ἐπιθυμίαι) that are moderate (μετρίαι) "are directed with thought and correct belief by reason" (μετὰ νοῦ τε καὶ δόξης ὀρθῆς λογισμῷ ἄγονται, *Republic* 4, 431c5–7). Here, some think that Plato anticipates

[1] See §V.b.–§V.c. in the Introduction for a brief history of the view that passions should be moderated (μετριοπάθεια) rather than eliminated (ἀπάθεια).

the Aristotelian notion that passions that are neither in excess nor in deficiency are best directed to appropriate ends, in the right manner, at the right time, with all of the necessary qualifications of moral virtue in place.[2] Further evidence is thought to be found in the notion that being well educated (εὖ παιδευόμενοι) leads to the development of moderate individuals (μέτριοι ἄνδρες, 4, 423e5–6). The language of moderation also seems to crop up in Socrates' remarks near the end of the Myth of Er as he reflects on how one is to make the best choice of one's next life before reincarnation. A human becomes happiest (εὐδαιμονέστατος γίγνεται ἄνθρωπος), Socrates concludes, if one

[T19] γνῷ τὸν μέσον ἀεὶ τῶν τοιούτων βίον αἱρεῖσθαι καὶ φεύγειν τὰ ὑπερβάλλοντα ἑκατέρωσε καὶ ἐν τῷδε τῷ βίῳ κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ ἔπειτα.

knows how to choose the mean always in such things and to flee from excesses in either direction as much as is possible in this life and in every one thereafter.
(Plato, *Republic* 10, 619a5–b1)

"Excess in either direction" seems to denote both excess and deficiency, the two extremes on either side of the mean. But, is this really the same notion that we find in Aristotle and does it establish that *passions* must be moderated for the happy life in Plato's *Republic*? I will return to these passages below, but first let us take the clearest case that reveals the verbal similarities to the later tradition of μετριοπάθεια to be misleading when one tries to read them back into Plato's *Republic*. Let us turn to the case of grief.

At first glance, as in the passages above, it appears that Socrates is interested in the moderation of passions (μετριοπάθεια), not their elimination (ἀπάθεια), when he discusses

[2] See Alcinous, *Handbook* 184.24–8, which I discuss below. Cf. Gronau 1914, p. 254, and Lilla 1971, p. 99 and n. 4, who cite these passages from the *Republic* (4, 423e4–5, 431c5–7; 10, 619a5–b1) as a possible anticipation of Aristotle's doctrine of the mean. Cf. also Kinneavy 1986. For Aristotle's doctrine of the mean see *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.5; 2.6, 1106a26–8, 1106b21–3, 1107a8–15; 2.7; 2.9, 1109a26–9; *Eudemian Ethics* 2.3, 1221b11–17; 2.10, 1227b6–12. Cf. Woods 1982 for notes on the passages in the *Eudemian Ethics*; Sorabji 2000, pp. 194–5.

situations in which one feels grief. In *Republic* 10, Socrates asks whether the virtuous man will feel nothing at the loss of his son, which would amount to insensitivity and lack of feeling, or if he will moderate (μετριάζειν) his feelings of grief:

[T20] νῦν δέ γε τόδ' ἐπισκεψώμεθα, πότερον οὐδὲν ἀχθέσεται, ἢ τοῦτο μὲν ἀδύνατον, μετριάσει δέ πως πρὸς λύπην.

> Now, let us look into this, whether he will feel no grief at all, or, if that is impossible, whether he will somehow moderate his grief. (Plato, *Republic* 10, 603e8–9)

Socrates and Glaucon agree that the answer falls to the latter option. From this brief exchange, it looks as though Socrates has moderation of passions in mind as the goal, especially since he speaks of somehow moderating (μετριάζειν πως) grief. Alcinous, in the later tradition, takes Plato's *Republic* as teaching just that: in contrast with the one who feels no grief and lacks feeling (ἀπαθής), the one who grieves suffers the loss moderately (μετρίως δὲ τοῦτο πάσχων) and is moderate in his passions (μετριοπαθής).[3]

Yet in the context of this discussion in the *Republic*, that option is chosen only because the other course of feeling no grief at all is probably impossible. The discussion that precedes and follows [T20] reveals that Socrates and Glaucon both think that it would be preferable to be entirely without passion, if it were possible.[4] The virtuous man not only attempts to render his conduct as least conducive to the outward appearance of being distressed when his equals see him (10, 604a1–7), but he will also fight to suppress the experiences of grief within himself, since these passions are inappropriate motions of his inferior nature that his rational side must quell (10, 604a1–b5).[5] In maintaining an outward and inward composure, the virtuous man,

[3] *Handbook* 184.24–8.
[4] Cf. Dillon 1993, p. 188. See the similarity to the Stoic position in Seneca, *Letters* 99, esp. 99.15.
[5] It is very brief, but Socrates draws upon the argument for critical psychic conflict in the case of grief. The better choice endorsed by reason opposes the inappropriate course of giving in to the feelings of grief.

Socrates and Glaucon agree, will take the death of a loved one with the greatest of ease (ὅτι ῥᾷστα) compared to normal people (10, 603e4–6). The virtuous man will be as close as he can to the ideal of passionless and griefless bearing of trials and loss. As stated in the parallel passage of *Republic* 3, he will lament his loss the least (ἥκιστα ὀδύρεσθαι) and bear the death of a son or brother as mildly as is possible (ὡς πραότατα, 3, 387d11–e8). With each superlative, we get the sense that the virtuous man comes as close to feeling no pangs of despair at the loss of friends and loved ones as any human can. He is on an asymptotic approach to ἀπάθεια, coming as close to the limit of lacking any feeling as is possible, though the ultimate eradication of the source of his passions is not itself possible. He will never reach the goal, but it no less seems to be the ideal worth pursuing.

Even though he cannot completely remove the potential to feel grief, the virtuous man will attempt to deaden his feelings. Socrates even gives a number of rational arguments to help in this task (10, 604a1–b5). Socrates argues that there is no reason to think grief profitable or warranted, even at the loss of what most people think most dear to them, their own child. First, we do not know whether their death will turn out to be a good or bad thing.[6] Secondly, it is of no profit to our future for us to bear the loss badly. Thirdly, "nothing in human affairs is worth much serious consideration" (οὔτε τι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἄξιον ὂν μεγάλης σπουδῆς, 604 b10–c1).[7] Finally, grief hinders our ability to think clearly and to deliberate well (604b7–c4). Socrates concludes the discussion, arguing that entertaining our feelings of grief is as senseless as a child holding on to where it hurts; we must avoid grief like a diseased state that we need to heal and

[6] Cf. Plato, *Apology* 29a7–b1.
[7] Cf. Plato, *Laws* 7, 803b3–5: "In point of fact, the affairs of humans are not worthy of much seriousness, but it is necessary to treat them as serious at any rate" (ἔστι δὴ τοίνυν τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πράγματα μεγάλης μὲν σπουδῆς οὐκ ἄξια, ἀναγκαῖόν γε μὴν σπουδάζειν).

move past (10, 604c5–d1).[8] As Socrates stresses here, grief is *not useful*, but instead is a hindrance to our rational capacities and a potential disruption in the virtuous life.

In the discussion of grief in the *Republic*, Socrates proposes that we attempt to achieve internal serenity that is immune from circumstances and states of affairs outside our control. That goal is not far removed from the insensitivity of the Stoic ideal, which we saw Plutarch rejecting as inhuman in the last chapter. Even more troubling is the similar motivation that Socrates presents for avoiding grief as far as we are able, namely, the ideal of invulnerability.[9] In support of the thesis that the virtuous man will be least likely to grieve a loved one's death, Socrates notes that the virtuous human will be most self-sufficient and least in need of friends:

[T21] ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τόδε λέγομεν, ὡς ὁ τοιοῦτος μάλιστα αὐτὸς αὑτῷ αὐτάρκης πρὸς τὸ εὖ ζῆν καὶ διαφερόντως τῶν ἄλλων ἥκιστα ἑτέρου προσδεῖται.

> But surely we also say this, that such a person will be most self-sufficient for living well and, far beyond others, will least be in need of another person.
>
> (Plato, *Republic* 3, 387d4–6)

The blessed life consists in virtue, which is immune to the vicissitudes of chance and the conditions of external goods or evils. External items apparently also include other people, the other individual (ἕτερος) that the virtuous person can do just as well without.[10] This is in line

---

[8] Cf. *Phaedo* 83b.

[9] For further discussion on this point and the next three passages see Nussbaum 1986, p. 20; 1994, pp. 92–3. See also Williams 1976, p. 115; Carone 2002, pp. 339–40.

[10] Cf. Plato, *Gorgias* 470e9–11; *Republic* 1, 354a1–9. The virtuous person is said to be happy because of her virtuous state, not because of any external goods. Cf. Carone 2002 *passim*. In *Laws* 3, 693c2–5, however, self-control, practical wisdom, and friendship (φιλία) are all the same goal of harmonious wisdom. Friendship, then, seems to be entailed by virtue. In *Laws* 5, 730c1–d2, the man who would be blessed and happy will abide in honesty, but the fool has no friends and becomes an isolated and miserable individual later in life. Friendship, again, seems to be a sign of virtue. In both of these cases, however, friendship is not said to be a necessary part of the good life. The virtuous may be the best friends one could have, but *they* do not need friends if virtue is sufficient for happiness. In a paper presented at the University of Michigan, "The Real Challenge of the *Republic*" (January 23, 2015), Rusty Jones, rightly, I think, argues that many fail to notice the distinction between instrumental / final goods and conditional / unconditional goods in *Republic* 2, which one might suppose allows for friendship to be a conditional instrumental or conditional final good for one's happiness. Even if that is the case, friends do not appear to be *necessary* for one's happiness, if virtue is sufficient for happiness. See also nn. 62–3 in Chapter 1.

with the evaluation of external goods and relationships we saw above in *Republic* 3 and 10: "nothing in human affairs is worth much serious consideration" (οὔτε τι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἄξιον ὂν μεγάλης σπουδῆς, 10, 604 b10–c1), life, death, and suffering included (3, 387d4–6).[11] In the *Apology*, we find a parallel devaluation of all items external to one's virtuous state, including death (30c7–d6; 41c8–d3). There Socrates argues that a good man cannot be harmed, even if disenfranchised or killed.

Yet, there is something more disturbing in the passages on grief in the *Republic* than the thoughts expressed on disvaluing one's own suffering and death. Even if we consider our own deaths nothing to be feared, we might still think that our evaluation of the loss of other individuals should count for something in our own well-being, as we saw Plutarch arguing in the last chapter. Our concern for others seems disingenuous if it is disconnected from their well-being. As with the Stoic notion of invulnerability, the passages on grief in the *Republic* teach us that we ultimately must be rather insensitive, cut off from concern for the physical situation or feelings of others, in order to maintain self-sufficiency and to avoid indulgence in our passionate nature. Friends may be good to have, but the good they bring does not seem to make any difference to our own happiness if we are like the virtuous man of the *Republic*. Although we might have thought that the argument moves toward a more neutral vision of moderating passions, signaled by Socrates' use of μετριάζειν in [T20], the moderation of passions (μετριοπάθεια) that the *Republic* advises, like the Stoic ideal, amounts to more of a mutilation

[11] Cf. also Vlastos 1991, pp. 200–32. There are indications in Plato's works that certain states of suffering render embodied life not worth living, despite what appears to be a strong thesis that virtue is sufficient for happiness elsewhere. See Plato, *Gorgias* 512a; *Crito* 47d–e. Even in the *Republic*, there are certain cases in which it would be best to let one die a natural death rather than prolong a state of suffering that is unnecessary and not useful (3, 407d4–410a4). Cf. Cooper 1989, Section II for further discussion.

of the non-rational side of human nature. The *Republic*'s teaching on moderation is really a lesson in emotional suppression with the ideal of the passionless state as the goal (ἀπάθεια).[12]

§II Plutarch on the Naturalness and Usefulness of Grief

We will see that this approach to passions in Plato's dialogues is not peculiar to grief in §III, but first we will start with the strongest case Plutarch makes for the moderation of passions in his defense of grief. For Plutarch there is no virtue of grief, but neither is it a vice to feel grief. Grief nevertheless is important. Plutarch holds it to be so fundamental to our attachment and concern for other people that we cannot be rid of it entirely and still be fully human.[13]

As we saw in the last chapter, Plutarch argues that it is *natural* to feel grief in appropriate situations. He does not mean that it is natural in a derogatory sense of a human nature that we must overcome, but natural as part of the human nature we ought to develop.[14] It would be unnatural, less than human, not to feel grief at the death of one's son. I repeat here a quotation from the previous chapter for the reader's convenience:

[T16] τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀλγεῖν καὶ δάκνεσθαι τελευτήσαντος υἱοῦ φυσικὴν ἔχει τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς λύπης, καὶ οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῖν. οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε συμφέρομαι τοῖς ὑμνοῦσι τὴν ἄγριον καὶ σκληρὰν ἀπάθειαν, ἔξω καὶ τοῦ δυνατοῦ καὶ τοῦ συμφέροντος οὖσαν...τὸ γὰρ ἀνώδυνον τοῦτ' οὐκ ἄνευ μεγάλων ἐγγίγνεται μισθῶν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· τεθηριῶσθαι γὰρ εἰκὸς ἐκεῖ μὲν σῶμα τοιοῦτον ἐνταῦθα δὲ ψυχήν.

> Therefore, to feel pain and the gnawing bites of pain when one's son dies has a source of grief that is natural and outside our control. For I, for my own part, cannot agree with those [the Stoics] who sing hymns of praise to that cruel and callous lack of feeling, which is both outside the realm of possibility and not beneficial…. For this insensitivity

[12] Cf. Laks (forthcoming), esp. pp. 30–2. Laks' discussion concerns Presocratic philosophers, but his point on the dangers of reading concepts back into earlier authors based on verbal similarities is well taken, especially in doxographic approaches to ancient philosophers.
[13] See Chapter 1, §IV–§V.
[14] Contrary to Cicero, Plutarch affirms the naturalness of such experiences of grief. Cicero argues that the experience of grief may be human, but that does not weigh in its favor. Instead, he believes that we ought to aim beyond our nature and therefore sides more closely with the Stoic goal of eradicating grief (*Tusculan Disputations* 3.12–13; cf. also 3.71). See Graver 2002, pp. xxv and 187–94; Gill 2006, p. 173, n. 207.

> to pain comes about in a human only at a great expense; for it is the body, in the former case, which has been brutalized, but in the latter case, the soul.
> (Plutarch, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102C5–E1)[15]

The unnatural state of immunity to grief in such situations is the sign of a hardened heart. Such a lack of passion (ἀπάθεια) should be deemed harmful (βλαβερόν) and a trait associated with a worthless person (φαῦλον, *Cons. Ap.* 103D4–7).[16] Ironically, though Socrates, like the Stoics, considers grief a diseased state of the soul, insensitivity and rejection of passion are the true diseases of the soul (νοσήματα ψυχῆς, *On Affection for Offspring* 497C9–D8). The inability to feel passions is not only unnatural, it is also unhealthy. But, Plutarch also interestingly says more. Such a condition would not even be beneficial (σύμφερον) if it were possible.

Plutarch now is engaged not only with the Stoic arguments against grief, but with the thrust of Socrates's arguments in *Republic* 3 and 10. For Socrates, as we saw above, grief only provides a stumbling block to clear thinking and useful actions; it is in no way profitable to give in to feeling grief (10, 604 b10–c1). Instead, fighting and resisting the feeling as much as one is able is more beneficial (604a1–b5) since it would be better if we could not feel it at all. Plutarch, to the contrary, considers the passionless state, which Socrates puts forward as the goal, to be unbeneficial. In the final lines of [T16], Plutarch writes that one must count the cost of the passionless state.

The price for attaining such a state or getting as close as we are able to that goal is great (μεγάλων μισθῶν). In the section I elided in [T16], Plutarch argues that we forfeit the good passions if we eliminate the possibility of experiencing painful ones:

---

[15] I consider this a genuine work of Plutarch. On the authenticity of this work see n. 117 in Chapter 1.
[16] "Therefore we must also leave this [ἀπάθεια] well enough alone as something harmful and associated with a worthless person and least befitting virtuous men" (διὸ καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἐατέον ὡς βλαβερὸν καὶ φαῦλον καὶ σπουδαίοις ἀνδράσιν ἥκιστα πρέπον).

[T22] ἀφαιρήσεται γὰρ ἡμῶν αὕτη [ἀπάθεια] τὴν ἐκ τοῦ φιλεῖσθαι καὶ φιλεῖν εὔνοιαν, ἣν παντὸς μᾶλλον διασῴζειν ἀναγκαῖον.

> For, this [lack of feeling] will deprive us of the benevolence that comes from loving and being loved, which it is necessary to protect above all else.
> (Plutarch, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102C10–D2)[17]

The passionless state is callous and cruel not only in disregarding the misfortunes of others as of no real concern, but also because it leads to a state of insensitivity that robs us of the experiences of joy and love we find in friendship. As we saw in Chapter 1, benevolence involves not only sharing in grief, but also joy (τὸ συγχαίρειν καὶ συναλγεῖν, *On Moral Virtue* 451E4–5).[18] It also derives from true friendship and love for one another; hence the use of both active and passive forms of love involved in the benevolence experienced between friends (ἡ ἐκ τοῦ φιλεῖσθαι καὶ φιλεῖν εὔνοια, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102C10–D1). We stand to lose genuine benevolence, joy, love, friendship, and affection if we pursue a passionless state that is invulnerable to emotional pain. As we saw in Chapter 1, Plutarch considers these to be important aspects of the good life. Since we lose positive features of our emotional life and relationships, deadening our sensitivities is not beneficial.[19]

Plutarch pushes further against the proposed suppression of grief than Crantor, his Academic predecessor. Plutarch quotes Crantor in his argument that it is far better to endure painful emotions such as grief rather than to render ourselves incapable of positive emotions:

[T23] "μὴ γὰρ νοσοῖμεν" φησὶν ὁ ἀκαδημαϊκὸς Κράντωρ, "νοσήσασι δὲ παρείη τις αἴσθησις, εἴτ' οὖν τέμνοιτό τι τῶν ἡμετέρων εἴτ' ἀποσπῷτο."

---

[17] Cf. Plutarch, *On Compliancy* 529A–D: We must be careful in attempting to remove negative aspects of our emotional life lest we mar our sensitivity and lose the source of positive aspects, such as a sense of shame, together with it. I take up this point further in Chapters 5 and 6.
[18] =[T6] in Chapter 1.
[19] Stoics will deny that we must forfeit good feelings in removing our passionate states, but Plutarch's argument still holds in terms of genuine care and concern, as I argued in Chapter 1 (§IV). Cf. Annas 1992, pp. 113–15.

> "For let us not be sick," Crantor the Academic says, "but let there be some feeling for us if we are sick, if indeed some part of ours should be cut out or removed!"
> (Plutarch, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102D7–10)[20]

We would prefer not to be sick, Crantor argues, but it would not be worth the cost of not feeling sick to lose sensation altogether. Likewise, the ability to feel painful emotions, though it is generally undesirable, should be endured so that we will also be able to experience good emotions. There are parts, i.e. emotions, that we do not want cut out of us.[21] Beyond losing the capacity for good emotions ourselves, Plutarch, argues that the greatest danger comes in cutting us off from genuine friendships and intimacy. As we saw in Chapter 1, we must be able to experience grief if we are to be emotionally sensitive and share our lives in deep and intimate ways with others.[22] This unnatural and unhealthy state also deadens our relationships.

Plutarch pushes against Socrates' criticism in *Republic* 4 further. Contrary to the claims in the *Republic*, not only is the passionless state unbeneficial, but the experience of grief can itself be beneficial and useful.[23] Plutarch argues that sharing passions, even painful emotions of

---

[20] The quotation is from Crantor's lost work, *On Grief*. Cf. Plutarch, *Consolation to Apollonius* 104C1–15.

[21] Cicero provides similar quotations of Crantor's *On Grief* (see *Tusculan Disputations* 3.6.12. and n. 23 below). Cf. also Jerome, *Letter* 60.5; Pliny, *Natural History* Praef. 22. For further discussion see Graver 2002, "Appendix A: Crantor and the Consolatory Tradition," pp. 187–94. Cicero, however, rejects Crantor's position in favor of the Stoic doctrine of ἀπάθεια. See n. 14 above. Cf. also Sorabji 2000, pp. 182–3.

[22] See Chapter 1, §IV–§VI. Cf. also *Precepts of Statecraft* 824B2–6: To be insensitive and incapable of feeling grief when one's own state is in distress (οὐ μὴν ἀναίσθητον οὐδ' ἀνάλγητον ἐν στάσει) does not befit a good person.

[23] Cf. *Consolation to Apollonius* 105B13–D5, in which *Iliad* 24.522–33 is quoted to demonstrate the profitlessness in giving oneself over to grief. *Pace* Graver 2002, pp. 190–1, I do not believe that Plutarch presents this passage to suggest that giving in to grief is always profitless. Instead, in quoting Achilles' speech to Priam, Plutarch emphasizes that being carried away to excess in grief, as in cruel wailing (κρυερὸς γόος) is not a useful indulgence. The same can be said of *Consolation to Apollonius* 102A12–B5, where Plutarch speaks of profitless mourning (μάταιοι ὀδυρμοί) as excessive expressions after the appropriate measure of time has passed.

Crantor, Cicero relates, also argues that passions are natural and useful. Cf. *Academica* 2.135: "Those Old Academy members used to approve of moderation of passions, and they desired that there be a certain natural measure in every emotion. We have all read *On Grief* by the Old Academic Crantor…And certainly the Old Academy used to say that emotions were given to our souls by nature for use, fear for the sake of being cautious, pity and distress for the sake of mercy; they even used to say that anger was, as it were, the whetstone of bravery" (*Mediocritates illi probabant, et in omni permotione naturalem volebant esse quendam modum. Legimus omnes Crantoris veteris Academici* De Luctu*…Atque illi quidem etiam utiliter a natura dicebant permotiones istas animis nostris datas, metum cavendi causa, misericordiam aegritudinemque clementiae; ipsam iracundiam fortitudinis quasi cotem esse dicebant*).

grief and distress, can help in persuading those we love to avoid error and to do what is best. Shared grief gives opportunity for influence. In *On Brotherly Love*, Plutarch describes a situation in which reproof of error is required. When one's brother has acted foolishly,

[T24] πρὸς ἐκεῖνον δεῖ τρέπεσθαι καὶ καθάπτεσθαι σφοδρότερον, τὸ ἁμάρτημα καὶ τὸ ἔλλειμμα μετὰ παρρησίας ἐνδεικνύμενον. οὔτε γὰρ ἐφιέναι δεῖ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς οὔτ' αὖ πάλιν ἐπεμβαίνειν ἁμαρτάνουσιν αὐτοῖς (τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιχαίροντός ἐστιν ἐκεῖνο δὲ συνεξαμαρτάνοντος), ἀλλὰ κηδομένῳ καὶ συναχθομένῳ χρῆσθαι τῷ νουθετοῦντι.

> one ought to turn to him and rebuke him intensely, pointing out his fault and shortcoming with frankness. For one ought not to give license to brothers nor, on the other hand, step all over them when they err (since the latter is characteristic of one who gloats and the former of one who shares in the fault), but in his admonishment of his brother he ought to treat him as one he cares about and with whom he shares in his grief.
>
> (*On Brotherly Love* 483A8–B3)

Shared grief provides evidence of genuine concern and vested interest in another's well-being. It establishes a connection and position of influence one might not otherwise have, since our friends and loved ones recognize that we identify with their desires and interests.[24] With an established foundation of genuine concern and shared interest, one can admonish and rebuke with greater force in frankness,[25] appealing to that shared sense of suffering and concern, and steer one's brother away from future errors.[26] Emotions such as grief, then, are not wholly negative, even if they are inherently painful experiences, since shared grief is useful in our influence on others.

---

[24] Cf. Plutarch, *On Love* (Sandbach fr. 137=Stob. 4.20.69).

[25] Plutarch holds that frankness (παρρησία) is possible only between those who are φίλοι. Cf. *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 73C–D, 74C–D; *On Listening to Lectures* 47A–B. Cf. also O'Neill 1997, pp. 116–17, and Konstan 1997, pp. 113–14. On the use of shared grief and emotion in the persuasion of others see also more modern psychological studies such as Scheff 1998, esp. pp. 104–107 and 112.

[26] When we identify with the misfortunes and concerns of others, they tend to be more open to our criticism, especially if we identify with the faults they have committed and when we give advice from our own experience. Cf. Plutarch, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 72A6–8: "For those who seem to have committed the same faults and to correct their friends as they do themselves have their goodwill and trust" (καὶ γὰρ εὔνοιαν καὶ πίστιν ἔχουσιν οἱ ταὐτὰ μὲν ἁμαρτάνειν, ἐπανορθοῦσθαι δὲ τοὺς φίλους ὥσπερ αὐτοὺς δοκοῦντες).

Plutarch even encourages the sharing in grief with one another when appropriate. Plutarch emphasizes that true intimacy and shared concerns call for shared suffering:

[T25] ἀποθανόντος γε μὴν πατρὸς ἐμφύεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ὀρθῶς ἔχει τῇ εὐνοίᾳ τὸν ἀδελφόν, εὐθὺς μὲν ἐν τῷ συνδακρύειν καὶ συνάχθεσθαι κοινούμενον τὸ φιλόστοργον.

> When their father has died, it is, in truth, right more than previously for the brother to cling to the benevolence of his brother, immediately sharing his affection by weeping together and grieving together with him. (Plutarch, *On Brotherly Love* 483C4–7)

Grief is often experienced in common with others who share our loss. There are cases in which shared grief can become all the more painful as we reflect not only on our own feeling of loss, but also on the suffering of our loved ones who grieve with us. Yet, in some instances, our grief can itself be alleviated by sharing it with others (*How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 49F6–8).[27]

In his *Consolation to His Wife*, Plutarch gives us insight into his own experience.[28] At the loss of his daughter he struggles to keep his own grief within bounds as he writes to his wife, admitting that his struggle will be all the greater if he finds her grieved beyond measure (*Consolation to His Wife* 608B10–C1). He shares with his wife an intimately united set of passions, inclinations, and concerns as though they are of one mind, as is the natural manner for parents in their love of children (*On Affection for Offspring* 494A3–4). He and his wife must work together to experience their grief without letting it take a dangerous and excessive hold

[27] =[T14] in Chapter 1.

[28] Cf. Baltussen 2009, pp. 79–84. Baltussen argues that Plutarch's *Consolation to his Wife* is not an example of public posturing, as though merely following a tradition of consolatory letters and genre requirements, but instead expresses genuine grief and gives us rare insight into the emotional life and intimacy of a figure in Plutarch's period. Though the letter is highly stylized, as it is written shortly after Plutarch has become a prominent figure as a priest of Apollo at Delphi (cf. Pomeroy 1999, pp. 75–8), "[t]he degree of intimacy in this letter is quite unusual compared to many other extant consolations" (Baltussen 2009, p. 67). That Plutarch's daughter is the subject of this letter, given how young she is at around 2 years of age is unusual in letters of this kind (cf. Hawley 1999, p. 125; King 2000, p. 145), as is the fact that the letter is addressed to his wife (cf. Wilcox 2006, p. 75). For a brief synopsis of consolatory letters and literature, cf. Baltussen 2009, pp. 70–6.

within their souls (*Consolation to His Wife* 609F8–610A6). This, however, also means that they do not suffer alone in isolation without the help of another. They are able to give one another strength and encouragement through trying times (*On Having Many Friends* 94C8–D3).[29] They must share in the pains of their loss together just as they shared in their love for their daughter and in their love for one another. Joy and love come at a cost, but the price of grief is not too high to pay. The price of completely avoiding grief, however, is too much. We should not choose to protect ourselves against the death of children by being childless (δεῖ πεφράχθαι…μήτ᾽ ἀπαιδίᾳ πρὸς τέκνων θάνατον), nor guard against the loss of friends by being friendless (ἀφιλίᾳ πρὸς φίλων ἀποβολήν, Plutarch, *Solon* 7.3–4).[30]

In allowing for grief, Plutarch does not advocate the other extreme of excessive weeping and wailing, dirges, and the beating of breasts, which he thinks are embarrassing displays of an unbridled and shameful nature,[31] but rather the admittance of grief that is not beyond the bounds of propriety or good character (*Consolation to Apollonius* 102D2), but within its proper limits. He describes his own position as a "moderation of passion" (μετριοπάθεια), in which "we ought not reject a moderate experience of grief" (τὴν δὲ μετριοπάθειαν οὐκ ἀποδοκιμαστέον, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102D6–7).[32]

Here, the notion of moderating grief, unlike what we find in the *Republic*, is what it appears to be. We experience a certain amount of grief that is natural and appropriate. We should not exceed the upper limit of what is appropriate, but neither should we fall below the *lower* limit of how much grief one ought to feel, which would include feeling nothing at all:

---

[29] =[T13] in Chapter 1.
[30] Cf. Hertzoff 2008, pp. 347–8.
[31] *Consolation to His Wife* 609A4–C6, 609E1–F2; *Whether the Affections of the Soul are Worse Than Those of the Body* 501C12–D6.
[32] I will discuss Plutarch's more general formula and argument for the moderation of passions in §V–§VII.

[T26] οὔτ’ οὖν ἀπαθεῖς ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων συμφορῶν ὁ λόγος ἀξιοῖ γίγνεσθαι τοὺς εὖ φρονοῦντας οὔτε δυσπαθεῖς…εὐλόγιστος δ’ ὁ τὸν οἰκεῖον ὅρον ἔχων καὶ δυνάμενος φέρειν δεξιῶς τά τε προσηνῆ καὶ τὰ λυπηρὰ τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ συμβαινόντων.

> Reason demands that those who are prudent not be devoid of passion in such misfortunes [as losing one’s child] nor excessive in their passions…but the reasonable person is the one who holds to the appropriate limit and is able to bear rightly both the pleasant and painful things that happen to him in life.
>
> (Plutarch, *Consolation to Apollonius* 102E2–8)

In contrast with Socrates’ advice, we cannot and should not suppress grief as far as is humanly possible, since we will be deficient in the passion. The passionless bearers of misfortune (ἀπαθεῖς) are not prudent. Their fault lies on the opposite side from those who are excessive (δυσπαθεῖς), but their actions are nonetheless also irrational and foolish.

Plutarch’s position is consistent with the suppressed expression of grief in public, but not the complete suppression of its expression within the soul.[33] In his biographical works, for instance, he praises Phocion for bearing a passionless countenance (ἀπάθεια) as a sign of high-mindedness (μεγαλοψυχία) when he and his men are shamefully led to prison to await their unjustly pursued execution. Despite false accusations of treachery, Phocion stands as an example in contrast with those who gave themselves to shameful public display of wailing and crying out in dirges (ὀδυρόμενοι καὶ καταθρηνοῦντες, *Phocion* 36.1).[34]

---

[33] Cf. Dillon 2016, pp. 12–15, who argues that Plutarch has a less technical use of ἀπάθεια in his biographical works, which leads to somewhat ambiguous statements that seem to praise the ἀπάθεια of significant individuals in the *Lives*. I think that the case is less ambiguous than Dillon seems to indicate, since, as Becchi (1999, esp. pp. 38–43; 2005; 2014, pp. 78–85) argues Plutarch sometimes indicates through the description of a character as ἀπαθής not the ideal of being completely without passions or entirely suppressing passions, but as one who is in control of one’s passions and not led astray by passions or overcome by bad passions. These individuals are moderate in their passions. Cf. *Alexander* 4.8; *On the Great Fortune or Virtue of Alexander* 2, 338E, 339A–B; *Pelopidas* 26.8; *Coriolanus* 15.4; *Cato Minor* 14.4; *Artaxerxes* 12.1; Becchi 2014, p. 85).

[34] Cf. Plutarch, *Solon* 7: Some people disgrace themselves by indulging excessively in grief over the death of a horse or a dog. Cf. Hertzoff 2008.

Plutarch also shows a high opinion of Cleomenes for maintaining his composure at the death of his wife, not allowing himself to be overcome with sorrow while he still is required to lead his troops with a clear head and a bearing that inspires confidence:

[T27] οὐ μὴν κατήσχυνεν οὐδὲ προήκατο τῷ πάθει τὸ φρόνημα καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ φωνὴν καὶ σχῆμα καὶ μορφὴν ἐν ᾧ πρότερον εἶχεν ἤθει διαφυλάττων τά τε προστάγματα τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν ἐδίδου καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀσφαλείας τῶν Τεγεατῶν ἐφρόντιζεν.

He certainly did not bring himself dishonor nor deliver his proud spirit and the greatness of his soul up to the passion of grief, but he maintained his voice, appearance, and composure in the manner as before, and he gave orders to his commanders and continued to take thought for the safety of Tegea. (Plutarch, *Agis and Cleomenes* 43.2.3–3.1)

Although deeply affected, Cleomenes does not give in to his feelings of sorrow and grief while his post of leadership requires him to be decisive. He defers the experience until he returns home to his family. There he mourns his loss with his mother and children before returning to his post once more (43.3.1–4).[35]

In praising such acts of deferred grief, Plutarch nonetheless emphasizes the naturalness and reasonableness of feeling grief, especially in Cleomenes' case:

[T28] καὶ ἀπαγαγόντι τὴν δύναμιν, ἑσπέρας ἤδη περὶ Τεγέαν ἀφίκοντό τινες ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος οὐκ ἐλάττονα τῆς ἐν χερσὶ δυστυχίαν ἀπαγγέλλοντες, τεθνάναι τὴν γυναῖκα, δι' ἣν οὐδὲ ταῖς πάνυ κατορθουμέναις ἐκεῖνος ἐνεκαρτέρει στρατείαις, ἀλλὰ συχνῶς κατέβαινεν εἰς Σπάρτην, ἐρῶν τῆς Ἀγιάτιδος καὶ περὶ πλείστου ποιούμενος ἐκείνην. ἐπλήγη μὲν οὖν καὶ ἤλγησεν, ὡς εἰκὸς ἦν νέον ἄνδρα καλλίστης καὶ σωφρονεστάτης ἀφῃρημένον γυναικός.

And as he was leading his force back home, around Tegea certain men came from Lacedaimon when it was already evening and reported a calamity no less severe than the one at hand: his wife had died. She was the reason he could not bear to remain even in very successful expeditions, but constantly went back to Sparta; he loved Agiatis and valued her more than anything else. Therefore, he was struck with pain and grief, as was reasonable for a man just recently robbed of a most beautiful and prudent wife. (Plutarch, *Agis and Cleomenes* 43.1.2–2.3)

[35] Cf. Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 22.2–4, where Plutarch likewise praises Demosthenes for putting the concerns of the commonwealth, when he was needed to attend to the city's affairs, above his own need for grief.

Far from faulting Cleomenes for feeling grief and being struck with pain, Plutarch acknowledges that such an emotional response was fitting and reasonable in the situation (ὡς εἰκὸς ἦν), especially considering the intense love Cleomenes felt for his wife.

Nor does Plutarch give the sense that Cleomenes over-valued his wife's importance to his life. Plutarch emphasizes the high esteem in which Cleomenes held his wife and the deep intimacy of their relationship as warranting the experience of grief. Plutarch appears to admire Cleomenes all the more for acting prudently and controlling himself in service to his men *because* of the deep love and loss of his wife that he feels. Contrary to Socrates' argument in the *Republic* that we do not know whether our loved one's deaths or misfortunes might turn out to be a good thing (10, 604b8–9)[36] and the argument that nothing in human life is worth much seriousness (604b10–c1),[37] Plutarch takes the loss of one's loved ones to be a serious matter worthy of our grief.

Plutarch's view is a significant departure from the treatment of grief in Plato's *Republic*. Is Plutarch directly confronting what he takes to be Plato's position on this point or does he think that he is in line with the best view that Plato himself would endorse? I will argue below in §VII that Plutarch would not consider his own view to be in conflict with the philosophy of Plato's Academy, which includes Crantor as a member. Plutarch to some extent follows Crantor in his view that even the passion of grief is natural and that it would be unhealthy to eliminate the capacity to feel it. But, Plutarch emphasizes the interpersonal nature of passions far more in his defense on the moderate approach to grief than we find in Crantor's extant arguments.

[36] Cf. Plato, *Apology* 29a7–b1.
[37] Cf. Plato, *Laws* 7, 803b3–5.

More than that, Plutarch draws upon passages from Plato's *Republic* to defend his position that grief should be moderated, not eliminated. Plutarch's description of sharing pain (συναλγεῖν) seems to refer to a passage in *Republic* 5, which Plutarch quotes a few times to demonstrate the sense of shared identity that is possible between those who have shared passions (*Advice to Bride and Groom* 140D11–F12, *On Brotherly Love* 484B6–10, *Dialogue on Love* 767D5–E2). In *Republic* 5, the best city is likened to a body that shares in the pain of its parts (συναλγεῖν, 462c9–d5). Its citizens are affected together with one another, and the city "as a whole shares in pleasure or pain together" (ἢ συνησθήσεται ἅπασα ἢ συλλυπήσεται 462d6–e2). So, it appears that Plutarch emphasizes these notions from *Republic* 5 against the advocation of suppressing grief as far as is possible in *Republic* 4, but I defer for now a longer discussion of Plutarch's view of what it means to be part of the Platonic tradition until §VII.

§III Plato and the Negative Evaluation of Passions

Now, I would like to turn to the question of whether Plato's dialogues appear to advocate the moderation of passions or their complete suppression. We have already seen the case for an asymptotic approach to ἀπάθεια with regard to grief: we should suppress this emotion as far as humanly possible, coming as close to the complete absence of this passion as we are able. We might hope that grief is merely a particularly bad kind of passion that admits of no good or acceptable moderate state in the *Republic*. Perhaps other passions fare better in Plato's moral psychology and should be enjoyed and moderated rather than entirely suppressed to the point of near annihilation. Certain passions in Aristotle's moral psychology, after all, are not to be

moderated but instead opposed to the greatest extent possible. While most passions admit of a moderate and mean state for Aristotle, envy and *Schadenfreude* are altogether bad.[38]

As we will see below, however, the general trend we find in Plato's dialogues is that we would be better off without passions than with them. Even if we cannot entirely remove our capacity to feel passions in this life, we should nonetheless try to nullify their troublesome influence over our lives as much as we are able. Passions appear to be nothing more than necessary evils due to embodiment, while our true nature, what makes us human, is our rationality. Even passions that appear to be useful and helpful in this life, we will see, are not part of the ideal life of pure rationality. Spirited passions such as courage, anger, and a sense of shame look to be useful only insofar as they help to suppress even *worse* passions; they would serve no purpose if we were free from passions altogether. It even looks as though the passion of ἔρως, which is valorized and praised throughout the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, should be diverted toward rational pursuits, converted from passionate desires to purely rational desires.

That is one way of taking the evidence from Plato's dialogues, which we will explore below, not least because it seems to have influenced the very first followers of Plato in their view that passions should be eradicated. I should note up front, however, that it is not the only way of reading the treatment and evaluation of the passions in Plato's dialogues. After exploring the negative interpretation, I will return to passages that seem to point to a more positive evaluation of the emotions before arguing that the case is not clear-cut but instead ambiguous.

Let us begin with the problem of embodiment and the non-ideal state with passions. In Plato's *Timaeus* (41d4–42d2), we are given a likely story (ὁ εἰκὼς μῦθος, 29d2, 59c6, 68d2,

[38] *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.6, 1107a8–15. Cf. Sorabji 2000, p. 195.

and 72d7) of the creation of human souls and their implantation into physical bodies. Because of embodiment and the life of passions that results from embodiment, humans must struggle to overcome their passions and master (κρατεῖν) them to live justly. Otherwise, they will be conquered (κρατεῖσθαι) and live a life of injustice (ἀδικία, 42a3–b2). Only by constraining and subduing the turbulent (θορυβώδες), non-rational (ἄλογον) aspect of our nature through the course of one's life, or through several cycles of reincarnation, will a human return to the form of her *original* constitution, the original state of virtue (42d1–2),[39] i.e. the state that souls enjoyed before embodiment. Before embodiment, there was only the immortal soul, not compounded with the mortal aspects of the soul, the non-rational passionate parts:

[T29] οἱ δὲ μιμούμενοι, παραλαβόντες ἀρχὴν ψυχῆς ἀθάνατον, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο θνητὸν σῶμα αὐτῇ περιετόρνευσαν ὄχημά τε πᾶν τὸ σῶμα ἔδοσαν ἄλλο τε εἶδος ἐν αὐτῷ ψυχῆς προσῳκοδόμουν τὸ θνητόν, δεινὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα ἐν ἑαυτῷ παθήματα ἔχον.

> And imitating [the Demiurge], they [the gods] took the immortal principle of the soul and thereupon spread round it a mortal body and provided the entire body as a vehicle. They also framed a different mortal form of soul inside it, having dreadful and necessary passions within it. (Plato, *Timaeus* 69c5–d1)

The only part worthy to be called truly human was the divine part of the soul, its rationality (42a1–3). The gods only polluted this divine part of the soul (μιαίνειν τὸ θεῖον) as much as was required for embodiment (69d4–7).[40]

Passions in this picture are necessary aspects of embodiment that we must conquer and constrain as potential hindrances in our pursuit of the better, original constitution and its virtuous condition. They appear to be little more than necessary evils due to incarnation, and their usefulness consists entirely in their attendance to the body (69d4–72d3).[41] Whatever positive use

[39] τὸ τῆς πρώτης καὶ ἀρίστης ἀφίκοιτο εἶδος ἕξεως.
[40] *Pace* Johansen 2000, pp. 88–104, I have highlighted the negative descriptions of emotions in the *Timaeus*.
[41] Cf. Brennan 2012, p. 103: "The appetitive soul is best understood…as a response to the crisis of incorporation."

they serve, however, is outweighed by the further problems that they bring with them. Moral virtue in this life, moreover, consists not in moderating these passions but in keeping them from causing disturbance and becoming unruly; it consists in suppressing passions. In the course of time, the aim is to become purified, as it were, having subdued and removed the influence of passions so that we eventually become entirely free not only from experiencing passions, but also from their sources, the non-rational parts of the soul themselves (90b1–d7).

This negative portrayal of passions is not unique to the *Timaeus*. Nor is the passionless ideal of the purely rational soul peculiar to that dialogue. In *Republic* 10, the soul in its truest nature (τῇ ἀληθεστάτῃ φύσει) is rational, its ancient nature before it was beset by union with the body and other evils (ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ σώματος κοινωνίας καὶ ἄλλων κακῶν, 611a10–611c1). Embodiment here is explicitly listed as one among several evils (κακά). So too are the passions. The passage continues with a vivid analogy. The non-rational passions are mere accretions, like the oyster shells, rocks, and seaweed attached to the sea-god Glaucus, whose original nature has become obscured through entanglement with the seabed. In the human soul's case, its nature has been shrouded in confusion through its continued conjunction with the body and the passions that result from that union. Passions thus are foreign to the original, rational nature of the soul, which is its true nature. They are among the myriad of evils (μυρίων κακῶν) that have brought the embodied soul into its present, marred condition (611c1–d6), and the passionate portions of the soul are a result of the rational soul's plunge into the depths of physical incarnation (611d7–612a6).[42]

[42] Cf. Woolf 2012, esp. pp. 170–1.

In another passage from the *Republic*, the non-rational parts of the soul and the passions that arise from them are likened to a lion and many-headed beast that the "inner human" (ὁ ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπος) of the soul must subdue and make tame (*Republic* 9, 588b6–589b6). Even though one is encouraged to make the passionate parts of the soul obedient and friendly (φιλά) with the rational part of the soul, the embodied condition and the presence of the non-rational parts of the soul appear far from ideal and more of a denigration of the divine nature of the rational part of soul in its mixture with the nonsense (φλυαρία) and corrupting force of the body (ἀνάπλεως σάρξ, *Symposium* 211e2–3; *Phaedo* 66c2–4[43]).

First, in this image non-rational passions are so alien to human nature that it warrants the representation of the rational part as our true human nature, the inner human as opposed to the monstrous and bestial passionate parts of the soul.[44] Secondly, when we look more closely at the friendliness that one ought to pursue between the passions and reason, it turns out to be little more than an agreed submission and enslavement of the passionate parts to the rational part of the soul (*Republic* 9, 589c6–590d6).[45] Passions must be overcome. They are more easily

[43] The body "fills us with urges, desires, fears, all sorts of images, and a great deal of gibberish" (ἐρώτων δὲ καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ φόβων καὶ εἰδώλων παντοδαπῶν καὶ φλυαρίας ἐμπίμπλησιν ἡμᾶς πολλῆς). The appetitive and spirited parts of the soul in *Republic* 4, 436a–b and 9, 580d–e are the subjects of such desires and passions.

[44] Cf. Kamtekar 2006, p. 185, who argues that the agent-like descriptions of the soul's parts, especially in the analogy of the inner human, lion, and many-headed beast, are meant to draw us to identify more with the rational element within, since it is described as most human in form. Cf. also Singpurwalla 2013, p. 54: "It is reasonable to suppose that Socrates likens reason to the human being because it is our reason that makes us human, and thus distinguishes us from other animals. Thus, it is reasonable to suppose that Socrates, like Aristotle, considers the human function, purpose, or goal to consist in rational activity, including reasoning about what to do and living in accordance with those determinations." Cf. *Timaeus* 42a1–3: Only the rational part of the soul should be called our human nature.

[45] At first, the descriptions of enslavement only go in one direction: enslaving the best part of oneself to the worst part (καταδουλοῦται τὸ βέλτιστον ἑαυτοῦ τῷ μοχθηροτάτῳ, 589d7–e1), i.e. enslaving the rational part to the non-rational parts in the unjust state of the soul. But later, the subordination of the passionate parts of the soul also adopts the language of enslavement; those who have inferior intellects and cannot control their passions "ought to be the slaves of the one who is best, with the divine ruler [of reason] within himself" (δοῦλον αὐτόν…δεῖν εἶναι ἐκείνου τοῦ βελτίστου, ἔχοντος ἐν αὑτῷ τὸ θεῖον ἄρχον), and in this way they become friends (φίλοι, 9, 590c7–d6). The model of friendship envisioned for the passions as well as these individuals is enslavement.

overcome, moreover, if we do not feed them and make them grow strong, but instead starve them to make them weak.[46] Their presence can be tolerated if they provide no disturbances to reason.

The negative evaluation of emotions and the non-rational parts of the human soul encourages the notion that we would be better off without them. Passages from Plato's *Phaedo* further encourage complete suppression of our passions as far as we are able in this life. So far, we have seen in both the *Timaeus* and *Republic* that there is some hope that we might one day be free of passions in death, even if it takes several cycles of embodiment to achieve this freedom. For now, we do the best we can to suppress them. Plato's *Phaedo* takes the notion that we desire the death of our passionate nature a step further and advises one not just to suppress passions to tolerable levels, but to *deaden* our passions so that we escape the prison of the body while we are still in this life (62b2–6). Philosophy aimed at achieving the good life, Socrates argues, is itself a practice of death:

[T30] κινδυνεύουσι γὰρ ὅσοι τυγχάνουσιν ὀρθῶς ἁπτόμενοι φιλοσοφίας λεληθέναι τοὺς ἄλλους ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο αὐτοὶ ἐπιτηδεύουσιν ἢ ἀποθνῄσκειν τε καὶ τεθνάναι.

> For, it is likely that other people will not notice that all those who actually take hold of philosophy correctly do nothing other than practice dying and being dead.
>
> (Plato, *Phaedo* 64a4–6)

Philosophers deaden themselves in a way (ᾗ θανατῶσι) that escapes the notice of most observers (*Phaedo* 64b7–c1), namely, by deadening their association with passions and bodily concerns that hinder rational reflection.[47] Rational reflection requires "using pure rational thought by itself" (αὐτῇ καθ' αὑτὴν εἰλικρινεῖ τῇ διανοίᾳ χρώμενος, 66a1–2). To attain our highest

[46] As the inner lion and many-headed beasts are fed and strengthened, the inner human is starved and weakened (588e4–589a4). Though Socrates describes caring for the non-rational parts of the soul like a farmer (ὥσπερ γεωργός), his chief concern must be to weaken these parts to maintain control (589a6–b6). See the previous note. Cf. *Laws* 9, 934d4–935a7.

[47] I do not mean to imply that Plato's *Phaedo* or other dialogues advocate suicide. For further discussion on this topic see Cooper 1989; Warren 2001, pp. 91–106, esp. pp. 100–5; and Murray 2001, pp. 247–55.

goal, rational reflection, it looks as though we need to nullify the influence of our passions as much as possible by deadening our passionate nature (64c10–67b5). We bide our time with the necessary evils of embodied existence, the non-rational parts of the soul, exercising our rational capacity with the least distraction from passions until we reach the disembodied state and are, in all good hope, able to achieve complete eradication of the accretions of our non-rational, passionate nature. Until then, our best life here and now is found in pursuing the suppression and elimination of passions (ἀπάθεια) as far as it is possible for us.[48]

With this general picture in mind, when we look back at what appears to be the foreshadowing of Aristotle's view that passions should be moderated (*Republic* 4, 423e5–6, 431c5–7; 10, 619a5–b1), we see that the similarity is merely verbal. The condition of desires that are simple and moderate (ἁπλᾶς τε καὶ μετρίας) occur when moderation (σωφροσύνη) within the soul is achieved, but moderation is defined not as a virtuous condition of the passions, but rather as the condition of the whole soul when reason is in power and is not challenged by the passions (4, 431c9–432b1).[49] Moderation of the whole soul only requires that the passions *not interfere* with the direction that reason provides, but there is no indication here that passions are best when in a moderate condition themselves as a mean between the deficiency of passion and its excess. This definition of moderation in the *Republic* does not incorporate the notion that passions can be deficient, since it could be achieved by the union of the rational part of the soul with passionate parts that are completely inactive. The absence of passion, in fact, appears more

[48] Cf. Gill 2006, pp. 237–8: "In Plato's *Phaedo*…dualism between psyche and body is linked with an ideal which is close to that of *apatheia*. The philosopher's liberation of the psyche from the body is seen as bringing with it a liberation from the emotions and desires which are derivative from the body" (p. 237).

[49] "Consequently, we would be most correct to say that this unanimity is moderation, an agreement between what is worse and what is better by nature about which of the two should rule in the city and in each individual" (ὥστε ὀρθότατ' ἂν φαῖμεν ταύτην τὴν ὁμόνοιαν σωφροσύνην εἶναι, χείρονός τε καὶ ἀμείνονος κατὰ φύσιν συμφωνίαν ὁπότερον δεῖ ἄρχειν καὶ ἐν πόλει καὶ ἐν ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ).

ideal, since the situation of the soul is more secure if the unruly passions provide no potential resistance to the rule of reason within the soul. "Moderation" of the passions, by the *Republic*'s definition thus looks compatible with the absence of passions (ἀπάθεια).

The other two instances that seem to describe moderation in the *Republic* also fit this pattern. The moderate individuals (μέτριοι ἄνδρες) that result from good education are, again, moderate in the sense that they are not controlled by passions but instead by reason (4, 423e5–6). Even the argument that one should choose the mean in life does not mention choosing a mean state of passions in life, between deficiency and excess, but merely argues that we should avoid extreme kinds of lives like that of the tyrant and the pauper (10, 619a5–6). These passages, then, do not provide adequate evidence that the *Republic* foreshadows the Aristotelian view of μετριοπάθεια. Instead, they seem to fit with the overall picture that passions should be eliminated in this life as much as possible and that we should stifle the interference of passions in our attempt to be rational, since they are disturbances due to embodiment that hinder us from experiencing the purely rational life that is our true human nature.

Spirited passions are also included in this negative evaluation. Although spirited emotions and the spirited part of the soul are described as *useful* because they serve reason to suppress other errant passions (*Republic* 4, 439e8–440b7), their usefulness would no longer be needed if the passions were altogether removed. They serve no further, positive role apart from suppressing *even worse* passions of the body.[50] For this reason, the usefulness of spirited

[50] Cf. Brennan 2012: Brennan in several places describes the existence of the spirited part of the soul in Plato's dialogues as due to the *worse* passions of appetite that need to be suppressed. He writes, for instance, that "spirit is a necessary response to something worse than spirit, namely appetite" (p. 102); "a fully accurate picture of spirit requires you to see it exactly as a response to the dangers and excesses inherent in appetite" (p. 104); and "spirit's value is relational, and lies solely in opposing appetite" (p. 112).

emotions in the *Republic* and *Timaeus* appear to exist solely for the purpose of suppressing the worst passions in those whose reason is too weak to suppress these passions by itself.[51]

Even love or erotic desire (ἔρως), which plays a prominent role in both the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus* appears non-ideal as a non-rational passion. It should be channeled and directed toward rational activities and in pursuit of rational ends. In the *Symposium*, our passionate desire for beautiful bodies, beautiful souls, and the beauty we find in noble pursuits should lead us to move past all of these objects to pursue the Form of Beauty itself. We climb past these objects, as though on a ladder, directing our desire toward a rational end, no longer experiencing a non-rational passion for physical objects and all of the nonsense of embodied life (209e5–212a7), but instead we convert this desire into a rational desire to contemplate and be united with the ultimate reality of the Forms (210b7–212a7).[52] The *Phaedrus* likewise sets the goal of beholding the Forms as the greatest pursuit of the soul in its erotic desire (*Phaedrus* 247c3–248a6), though in the *Phaedrus* this pursuit also looks to the benefit of beloveds who are also on the journey to the Forms.[53]

---

[51] *Timaeus* 69e3–70e7; *Republic* 4, 437b1–4, 439e5–441a3, 441e4–5, 442a5–6, 442b7–8, 442c1–4; 9, 571b2–572b6, 588d2–3, 589b3–4. Cf. *Phaedrus* 253e5–254b1.

[52] The similarity to Freud's sublimation theory has not gone unnoticed. See Cornford 1950; Teloh 1976; Kahn 1987, p. 21; Santas 1988, pp. 77–9. Cf. Sassi 2011, pp. 256–7, for discussion of the previous author's positions and the history of scholarship on the connection.

[53] *Pace* Vlastos 1981, who argues that Plato's *Lysis*, *Symposium*, and *Phaedrus* treat others as vehicles for one's own fulfillment toward egoistically driven desire (pp. 8–10 and 20–33; cf. also Reshotko 2006, "Socratic Egoism," pp. 57–73), Plato's *Phaedrus* describes the more advanced lover ascending to the Forms through philosophy as a benevolent and beneficent agent, who tries to make his beloved as much like god as he can (ὁμοιότατον τῷ σφετέρῳ θεῷ, 253a7–b1). He attempts to improve the boy, acting as a god with no envy or lack of generosity (οὐ φθόνῳ οὐδ' ἀνελευθέρῳ δυσμενείᾳ χρώμενοι, 253b7–8). His benevolence and beneficence naturally follow from the true ascent of a lover with the result that Socrates deems this "the desire and completion of those who truly love" (προθυμία μὲν οὖν τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐρώντων καὶ τελετή, 253c2–3). This desire to improve the beloved is not self-interested for one's own self-improvement or progress. *Contra* Price (1989, pp. 96–102), neither is this desire aimed at one's own self-fulfillment in becoming immortalized through another, for which see also Ferrari 1991 (pp. 180–2). But, this occurs after the more advanced lover has made significant progress to the Forms himself.

The image of channeling desires in the *Republic* fits well with this notion. The more one is inclined toward non-rational ends, such as appetites or the desires that belong to the spirited part, the less one is inclined toward rational pursuits, and vice versa (Plato, *Republic* 6, 485d6–e1).[54] The motivational streams of the non-rational passions, which are associated with bodily pleasures,[55] can be diverted toward learning, which is an activity peculiar to the rational part of the soul (*Republic* 9, 581b6–11).[56] The fluidity of certain expressions of rational desire in the *Republic* strengthens the notion, since one can have an erotic desire for knowledge, such as when "a true love for true philosophy strikes" (ἀληθινῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀληθινὸς ἔρως ἐμπέσῃ, 6, 499c1), one can be affectionately disposed to wisdom (στέργειν, 7, 485c3–10), and one can be an ardent desirer of wisdom as a whole (σοφίας ἐπιθυμητής, 5, 475b8–9).[57] With greater force added to the desire for learning, passionate desires are weakened. Moderation, as it is defined in the *Republic*, becomes easier to obtain: bodily desires are more easily subdued once weakened (*Republic* 6, 485e2–486b8), which means they are more easily controlled by reason.[58]

---

[54] "Yet, truly, I suppose we know that by as much as desires incline strongly toward one thing, by that amount they are weaker toward other things, just like a stream channeled in a different direction…. So, when desires flow toward learning and everything of that kind, I suppose they would be concerned with the pleasure of the soul itself by itself, while they abandon the pleasures that come through the body, if one is truly a philosopher and not pretending to be one" (ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅτῳ γε εἰς ἕν τι αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι σφόδρα ῥέπουσιν, ἴσμεν που ὅτι εἰς τἆλλα τούτῳ ἀσθενέστεραι, ὥσπερ ῥεῦμα ἐκεῖσε ἀπωχετευμένον…. ᾧ δὴ πρὸς τὰ μαθήματα καὶ πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐρρυήκασιν, περὶ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς, οἶμαι, ἡδονὴν αὐτῆς καθ' αὑτὴν εἶεν ἄν, τὰς δὲ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἐκλείποιεν, εἰ μὴ πεπλασμένως ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς φιλόσοφός τις εἴη).

[55] *Republic* 4, 435e2–36b6; cf. *ibid*. 4, 442a4–b3; 9, 584c3–5; 10, 611a10–612a6; *Phaedo* 66c2–4, 94b7–c1.

[56] Cf. Cornford 1950, p. 70; Teloh 1976; Sassi 2011, who draw upon a generic sense of ἔρως to explain the shifting motivational streams in the *Republic*. Cf. also Cooper 2008, p. 32, n. 26, who also sees the account of changing objects of desire in the *Symposium* as lending support to the account of the *Republic*.

[57] In this last instance, rational desire takes on terminology that is usually applied to the lowest part of the soul, the appetitive part (ἐπιθυμητικόν): "Won't we say that the philosopher also is a *desirer of wisdom*, not just of this part, but not another part, but of the whole of wisdom?"(οὐκοῦν καὶ τὸν φιλόσοφον <u>σοφίας</u> φήσομεν <u>ἐπιθυμητὴν</u> εἶναι, οὐ τῆς μέν, τῆς δ' οὔ, ἀλλὰ πάσης). Cf. also the common usage of ἔρως for higher and lower objects of desire in Plato, *Gorgias* 481c–d. On this passage, cf. Carone 2004, p. 70.

[58] See also *Republic* 4, 442c4–7; 9, 586d4–587a2. Cf. Singpurwalla 2006, p. 270: "Socrates thinks that the individual who is ruled by reason will have *all* of her desires channeled toward the acquisition of knowledge, with the result that she simply will not have the sorts of unruly appetitive or spirited desires that motivate unjust acts." Emphasis added. Cf. also Penner 1991, p. 52; Carone 2004, pp. 70–1.

Each of these images and arguments is not only compatible with the attempt to completely suppress passions, but actually looks supportive of that position. The "moderation" of the *Republic* is defined as keeping the passions from interfering with reason and under its control, not obtaining a certain amount of good passion. The overall negative evaluation of passions as necessary evils of embodiment also indicates that we would be better off in a purely rational state, or in the closest approximation we can make to it. All of these images come in support of the overall view that the best life we can live even now is the one that attempts to take hold of the purely rational, disembodied ideal of passionless existence.

I am not arguing that this ideal is purely egoistic. In the *Apology*, Socrates risks his own life in his attempt to help others, i.e. by encouraging them to become virtuous. In the *Republic*, the philosopher-kings must seek to care for the citizens under their rule (7, 519c8–520e3). In the *Timaeus*, the paradigm of the Demiurge urges one to make the world the best one can (29e3). My contention is that this ideal appears to be one in which passions should be absent or nearly absent, even when one's actions are aimed at the good of others.

As I noted at the outset of the section, however, that is not the only way of interpreting the treatment of passion in Plato's dialogues. The *Phaedrus*' description of the soul as a charioteer and a team of horses presents a challenge to the view that the true nature of the soul is purely rational. In the mythical representation of the soul in the *Phaedrus*, the non-rational passionate parts of the soul appear to be present in the pre-embodied state of the soul and are represented as two horses which pull the rational part of the soul, the charioteer, around and allow him to see the Forms (246a2–257a2). If this is the true nature of the soul, it shifts the ideal away from the purely rational, disembodied soul. It also renders the passions themselves useful outside of their attendance to the body, since they contribute both to the rational desire to

contemplate the Forms and to the cultivation of virtues. The higher aloft the horses are able to carry the charioteer in this myth, the better the soul is able to see the Forms of Justice and Moderation and thereafter cultivate their corresponding virtues (*Phaedrus* 247c3–248a6). Once embodied, ἔρως helps the wings of the soul to regrow so that one can recollect the Forms (250c7–257a2).

The same would be true of ἔρως in the *Symposium*, which initiates the soul's pursuit of the Form of Beauty itself. The non-rational nature of this passion might even be a necessary condition in the *Symposium*, if one cannot ascend to Beauty itself except by the use of the steps on the ladder of love. The non-rational passionate nature of ἔρως, directed at the different objects on the way to the Forms, would not be inappropriate merely because this ἔρως is passionate, but only if one never moved on to the Forms themselves and remained stuck on a lower rung, as it were, and never realized that this desire should become focused on attaining the ultimate object of desire, the Forms themselves. So, it is possible to take a different message away from Plato's dialogues on the ideal condition of the soul and on the positive or negative evaluation of the passions in Plato's moral psychology and ethics.[59]

Following this ambiguity, Aristotle pits his own view of moderating emotions as a critical response to the goal of suppressing passions entirely, which he claims is pervasive among the earliest members of Plato's Academy.[60] Upon closer analysis, it is not hard to see why the early Academy might come to such a view and attribute it to Plato himself. The tradition within the

[59] I discuss Plutarch's use of more positive descriptions of passions and their benefits in Chapter 3. I should note that I am not assuming a developmentalist or a unitarian view of Plato's dialogues or Plato's thought expressed in his dialogues, since Plutarch does not himself appear to take a stance between those two ways of reading Plato's dialogues and thought. Instead, I have approached differences among Plato's dialogues as points that Plutarch himself takes into consideration in developing his own view.
[60] See also §V.b–§V.c. and nn. 71–2 in the Introduction.

Academy may change direction after Aristotle, as Crantor gives evidence to, but the earliest followers of Plato held a generally negative view of the passions as sources of error that we would prefer not to have altogether and which we hope one day to escape.[61]

§IV Plutarch on the Naturalness and Usefulness of Passions

In contrast with the negative evaluation of passions as necessary evils attached to our essentially rational human nature, Plutarch defends embodied human nature and argues that passions are both natural and can be useful. First, we will look at Plutarch's affirmation of the embodied condition of human nature and the naturalness of passions. We will then turn to Plutarch's arguments that passions are useful and have natural purposes. In the next section, we will look at Plutarch's view that moral virtue requires the presence of passions in moderate states, which then serve important functions in the moral life.

Just as in Plato's dialogues, Plutarch holds that passions are part of embodied human nature and result from the soul's first encounter and blending with the body.[62] The passionate part of the soul, i.e. the non-rational aspect, "has its generation from right within the body" (*On Moral Virtue* 450E6–F1),[63] "as though the passionate faculty grows from the root of the flesh"

[61] See also Becchi 1999, 2005, and 2014, who takes the notion to be mostly *selective* and aimed at *negative* and *bad* passions. I take it that such a selective view, which Becchi argues is compatible with the moderation of passions, might develop after Aristotle, but is not likely to be prevalent in the Academy before him, as Aristotle himself seems to indicate. See the previous note.

[62] See *Timaeus* 69c5–d1=[T29].

[63] "For, it is appropriate by nature for the rational, since it is divine, to lead and rule over the non-rational, *which has its generation from right within the body*. The non-rational part of the soul is naturally like the body and shares in its affections and is affected by them, after it has sunk into it and commingled with it. This is clear from the impulses that rise up and are moved toward corporeal objects, receiving their intensity and abatement with the changes of the body" (φύσει γὰρ προσήκει θεῖον ὄντα τὸν λογισμὸν ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ ἄρχειν τὴν γένεσιν αὐτόθεν ἔχοντος ἐκ τοῦ σώματος, ᾧ καὶ συνεξομοιοῦσθαι καὶ κοινωνεῖν παθῶν καὶ ἀναπίμπλασθαι πέφυκεν, ἐνδεδυκὸς αὐτῷ καὶ καταμεμιγμένον, ὡς δηλοῦσιν αἱ ὁρμαὶ πρὸς τὰ σωματικὰ κινούμεναι καὶ ἱστάμεναι καὶ σφοδρότητας ἐν ταῖς τοῦ σώματος μεταβολαῖς καὶ ἀνέσεις λαμβάνουσαι).

(451A7–8).[64] It is by blending with the body that the soul becomes a compound of rational and non-rational parts. This point is brought out most explicitly in *On the Sign of Socrates*, where Plutarch describes the mixture of soul with body:

[T31] ὅσον ἂν αὐτῆς [ψυχῆς] σαρκὶ μιχθῇ καὶ πάθεσιν, ἀλλοιούμενον τρέπεται καθ' ἡδονὰς καὶ ἀλγηδόνας εἰς τὸ ἄλογον.

> However much of it [the soul] mixes with flesh and its affections, that much of it changes into the non-rational part, altered according to the pleasures and pains of the flesh. (Plutarch, *On the Sign of Socrates* 591D5–7)

Only part of the soul mixes with the body, and from that mixture the passionate parts of the soul arise.[65] The part of the soul that does not mix with the body remains distinct from the non-rational parts as the rational part of the soul.[66] This much is generally in line with the picture we found in Plato's *Timaeus* and *Republic*.

Plutarch also holds that after death or before embodiment the rational part of the soul can be completely free of the presence and influence passions.[67] Where Plutarch departs from the

---

[64] ὥσπερ ἐκ ῥίζης τοῦ παθητικοῦ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀναβλαστάνοντος.

[65] The passionate faculty (τὸ παθητικόν) can more strictly specify what we would call the spirited part of the soul, and the non-rational (τὸ ἄλογον), the appetitive (*Platonic Questions* 9, 1008C2–11), but in [T29] and [T30], as is often the case in Plutarch's works, the two terms are co-referential for both the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul taken together and referred to as the non-rational part of the soul (τὸ ἄλογον, *On Moral Virtue* 442A1–4). The co-referential use of these terms is often marked by a hendiadys formulation: "the passionate, non-rational part" (τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἄλογον). Cf. *On Moral Virtue* 441C–D, 442B, 450B; *On Isis and Osiris* 371B; *On Moral Progress* 61D; *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 417B.

[66] A passage in *On the Face in the Moon* describes two mixtures of the soul, one with the body, the other with intellect (νοῦς): "But the ⟨mixture⟩ of soul ⟨and body⟩ produces ⟨the non-rational and passionate faculty,⟩ the conjunction ⟨of intellect and soul,⟩ reason" (ποιεῖ δ' ἡ μὲν ψυχῆς ⟨καὶ σώματος μ⟨ε⟩ῖξις τὸ ἄλογον καὶ παθητικὸν ἡ δὲ νοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς⟩ σύνοδος λόγον, 943A6–7). The non-rational (τὸ ἄλογον) affective capacity (παθητικόν) has its source in the soul's union with the body, since the mixture produces this part of soul, but then the rational part, reason (λόγος), is also the product of the soul's union with intellect (νοῦς). Immediately before this, we are told something similar, namely that every soul partakes in intellect (ψυχὴ πᾶσα νοῦ μετέσχεν, 591D4). I follow the emendation of Bernadakis in *On the Face in the Moon* 943A6–7, who draws upon Amyot in correcting the text: "et fait ceste composition de l'ame avec l'entendement la raison, et avec le corps la passion…," except that I have chosen to print "τὸ ἄλογον καὶ παθητικὸν" instead of "τὸ ἄλογον καὶ τὸ παθητικὸν" by comparison with the earlier passage of *On Moral Virtue* 442A3–4: "τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἄλογον." For further discussion of νοῦς and its relation to the human soul see Dillon 2001b, pp. 37–40, and Karamanolis 2006, pp. 109–12. Cf. also Jones 1916, pp. 27–40; Babut 1969a, pp. 470–2; O'Brien 2015, pp. 83–116.

[67] *On Moral Progress* 83E6; *On the Sign of Socrates* 593D2–8; *On the Face in the Moon* 944E4–F5; *On Tranquility of Mind* 476A10–C2; *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 417B4–9; *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible*

negative view of passions in the Platonic picture I painted above is in his refusal to denigrate the embodied state of passions. Instead, he affirms it. Embodied human nature, with its passions, is *no less* human.[68] In a fragment from his lost work, *In Defense of Beauty*, Plutarch asks, "Is not the nature of humans a compound of body and soul?" (οὐ σύνθετον φύσις ἀνθρώπων ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς; Plutarch, *In Defense of Beauty*=Sandbach fr. 144).[69] He goes on to argue in that fragment that it is such a compound; human nature *is* the compound of body and soul. Plutarch makes much the same point in *On the Face in the Moon* (943A1) and in *On Moral Virtue* (441D4–6), arguing that human nature is correctly understood to be composed of body and soul, and that the soul is itself a compound of rational and non-rational aspects. More emphatically, human nature is *best* understood as embodied.[70] This seemingly small point is quite revolutionary. It runs counter to the claims we have seen in the *Timaeus*, *Republic*, and *Phaedo*, in which the essence of human nature is captured by the rational part of the soul alone before embodiment or at disembodiment. What is *truly* and *essentially* human nature, according to those works, is the original, unembodied form of the soul; passions merely result from embodiment but

1105C1–D10. Cf. *On Isis and Osiris* 382F. Cf. Jones 1916, pp. 27–40; Dillon 1977, pp. 219–24, and 2001b, pp. 37–40; O'Brien 2015, pp. 83–116. I return to these passages and this notion in Chapter 6.

Plutarch usually describes the rational part as free from error without interference, but in the afterlife myth of *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 567B, some individuals are flayed and opened up to reveal that they have vice in their rational and ruling part of the soul (ἐν τῷ λογιστικῷ καὶ κυρίῳ τὴν μοχθηρίαν ἔχοντας). As in the *Phaedo* (81d), it appears that vicious passions have become attached to the soul and remain bound with the rational part after death.

[68] *Pace* Dillon 2016, pp. 11–12, I take it that in *On Moral Progress* 83E6, Plutarch is not setting out a passionless ideal for the one who is progressing in virtue. The hypothetical scenario of being free of passions in this life is used in Plutarch's dialectical argument against the Stoic denial of perceptible moral progress (83B8–C6). Elsewhere, Plutarch consistently argues that the passionless state is impossible while embodied: it is not possible to remove passion entirely (τὸ πάθος ἐξαιρεῖν παντάπασιν…οὔτε δυνατόν, *On Moral Virtue* 443C8–9).

[69] =Stob. 4.21.12.

[70] Cf. *On Isis and Osiris* 382F. Cf. also Dillon 1977, p. 197: The body "is an essential component of man."

are not part of our true or truest human nature.[71] While embodied, our true, rational nature becomes obscured and polluted (*Timaeus* 42a1–3, 69d4–7; *Republic* 10, 611c1–612a6).

Plutarch does not treat embodiment itself as a cause of shame or embarrassment for the human soul. It is the human condition with which we are most familiar. Our life here and now is important, moreover, as are the lives of others we encounter. This point already came out as part of Plutarch's defense of grief: grief is warranted when we consider this life and the lives of our friends important and worth grieving over when lost or when they suffer misfortunes, contrary to the assessment that this life is not worthy of much serious consideration (Plato, *Republic* 10, 604b10–c1; *Laws* 7, 803b3–5).

As we will see in Chapter 6, this point is also supported by Plutarch's emphatic denial that the Platonic goal of becoming like god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ)[72] should be understood as calling merely for contemplation, leaving this world behind together with the human life of passions and embodiment.[73] This life not only is important for Plutarch, but our imitation of god is also to take place *with* passions in this life, since the embodied state with passions is an *authentic* form of human nature. We are to imitate god, Plutarch argues, by benefitting others in this life, emulating divine benevolence and beneficence with our whole person, which includes our other-regarding

---

[71] Plutarch's notion that human nature is best understood as embodied also goes beyond the image of the tripartite, disembodied soul in the *Phaedrus*, since Plutarch more explicitly identifies the embodied condition as an authentic form of human nature. In this, he surely follows Aristotle.

[72] Plato, *Theaetetus* 176a5–b2. On the importance of ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ as the goal among Platonists see Alcinous, *Handbook* 152.30–153.24, 181.19–182.14; Arius Didymus (Stob. 2.7.3f (p. 49, l. 8–p. 50, l. 2)); D.L. 3.78; Philo of Alexandria, *On Flight and Finding* 63; Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* 5.14, 95.1–96.2. Cf. Armstrong 2004, p. 172: "Ever since ancient Platonists such as Eudorus, Philo, and Alcinous, Plato's notion of 'becoming like god' (ὁμοιώσις θεῷ), or 'following god' (ἀκόλουθος θεῷ) has been understood to be a flight from this world to a higher one." For references see Armstrong 2004, p. 172, n. 2. Cf. also Dillon 1977, pp. 71 and 121. On Alcinous and becoming like god see also Whittaker 1990, p. 137, n. 451, and Sedley 2012. I discuss these points further in Chapter 6.

[73] See Plotinus, *Enneads* 1.2. Cf. Festugière 1950, Merki 1952, Sedley 1997 and 1999, Annas 1999 (pp. 54–71). Plutarch also rejects the idea of god as self-centered and only contemplating his own nature in *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 426C1–D8, which he attributes to Aristotle, arguing that the supreme deity takes delight in watching over this world and the creatures therein. On this point see Chapter 6, n. 111.

passions.[74] Though passions may result from embodiment, they are not to be dispensed with or nullified as though they were *foreign* to human nature, not even as we attempt to become like god.

For Plutarch, passions are essential components of human nature that we should develop, not attempt to remove or suppress as far as possible. In *On Moral Virtue*, Plutarch argues that passions are not merely in some way necessary (ἀνάγκῃ τινί) due to embodiment but are also *natural* (φύσει) features of the soul in the embodied state (441D9–E1). Later in the same work, he denies that passions are introduced from outside the soul, as though foreign to it:

[T32] μέτεστιν οὖν αὐτῷ [τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, B11] καὶ τοῦ ἀλόγου, καὶ σύμφυτον ἔχει τὴν τοῦ πάθους ἀρχήν, οὐκ ἐπεισόδιον ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίαν οὖσαν, οὐδ' ἀναιρετέαν παντάπασιν ἀλλὰ θεραπείας καὶ παιδαγωγίας δεομένην.

> A human being has participation in the non-rational and has the source of passion as something natural, not as added [from outside], but as necessary, which should not be removed entirely but which needs cultivation and education.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451C2–5)

Passions must be developed, Plutarch argues, because they serve useful, natural purposes in this life and are part of the fulfillment of this life.[75]

Plutarch likens passions, generally, to beasts of burden and domesticated dogs that aid our tasks and are functionally serviceable to the soul (τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ ὑπηρετικόν, *On Moral Virtue* 451D6–8). Quoting Pindar,[76] he writes that the horse belongs under the yoke of the chariot, the ox is fit for the plow, and dogs aid our hunt for boars (*On Moral Virtue* 451D6–8).[77]

---

[74] *Philosophers and Men in Power* 776C8–D3; *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550A1–10, C12–E5, D1–3; *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780B8–792A5; *On Tranquility of Mind* 472A11–C5, 473A7–8; *Aristides* 6.3–5. Cf. *On Whether an Old Man Should Engage in Politics* 796C8–797A4. Plutarch is very much concerned with human virtue (ἀνθρωπίνη ἀρετή, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550D1–3), which is both moral and intellectual. See Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1102a7–1103a10.

[75] We will explore Plutarch's metaphor of cultivating passions like plants in §I of Chapter 6.

[76] Fr. 234 Maehler.

[77] Cf. Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods* 2.37: "For Chrysippus cleverly says that as the shield cover exists for the sake of the sword, while the sheath for the sword, in the same way everything except for the cosmos has been

Just as each of these animals has a purpose fit to aid a human task in agriculture or the hunt, the passions have roles to play in our actions: passions serve reason not only functionally, as instruments (ὀργανικά, 444D4–5),[78] but are also teleologically oriented to determined ends of service. Passions serve useful purposes. As Crantor is said to have argued, nature has given the passions to our souls for use, not in vain (Cicero, *Academica* 2.135).[79]

Plutarch emphasizes the usefulness of passions further, writing that while service animals are of great use, "the brood-like group of passions are *far more useful*" (πολὺ χρησιμώτερα τὰ τῶν παθῶν θρέμματα, 451D9). As we will explore in Chapter 3, Plutarch argues that passions are additions to our nature that aid our rational part and intensify virtues (τῷ λογισμῷ συμπαρόντα καὶ συνεντείνοντα ταῖς ἀρεταῖς, *On Moral Virtue* 452C5–6). They *contribute* to our moral life. More than that, as we will explore in Chapter 3, passions cannot be eliminated from our nature (τὸ πάθος ἐξαιρεῖν παντάπασιν…οὔτε δυνατόν), and even if they could, our lives would not be better for it (οὔτ' ἄμεινον, 443C8–10). Passions enhance our lives.

§V The Moderation of Passions (μετριοπάθεια) and Moral Virtue in Plutarch

Finally, let us turn to the most important defense of the passions that Plutarch provides in his theory of moral virtue. For Plutarch, passions are useful and natural not merely for the care of

---

generated for the sake of something else. For example, the crops and fruits that the earth produces [were generated] for the sake of animals, while animals for the sake of humans, as the horse was generated for the sake of transportation, the ox for the sake of plowing, and the dog for guarding. But man was created in order to contemplate and imitate the cosmos" (*Scite enim Chrysippus, ut clipei causa involucrum vaginam autem gladii, sic praeter mundum cetera omnia aliorum causa esse generata, ut eas fruges atque fructus quos terra gignit animantium causa, animantes autem hominum, ut ecum vehendi causa arandi bovem venandi et custodiendi canem; ipse autem homo ortus est ad mundum contemplandum et imitandum*). The argument in Cicero's work here, unlike that in Plutarch's *On Moral Virtue*, represents a Stoic argument for the intelligence of the cosmos as the end or τέλος in a hierarchy of creation. On the Stoic argument's use as part of the proof for the cosmos' intelligence see Salles (forthcoming).

[78] Moral virtue (ἡ ἠθικὴ ἀρετή) "needs the passionate for instrumental service to a practical end" (δεομένη τῆς παθητικῆς ὥσπερ ὀργανικῆς ὑπηρεσίας ἐπὶ τὸ πρακτικόν).

[79] *utiliter a natura…permotiones istas animis nostris datas*. See n. 23 above.

the body, but also as constituents of moral virtue and part of the fulfillment of our nature as moral agents. As we will see below, Plutarch holds not only that the passionate parts of the soul must be controlled by reason, as is the case in the definition of moderation in Plato's *Republic*, but passions themselves must also be in a moderate condition between deficiency and excess. There are proper limits to passions, both higher and lower, in Plutarch's conception of moral virtue.

To draw out the point, I would like to focus on Plutarch's metaphor of virtue as a kind of harmony between the different parts of the soul. This is not the only metaphor that Plutarch uses to elucidate the important contributions of passions and their ineliminable nature in his conception of moral virtue. We will explore several other metaphors in the chapters that follow. The metaphor of harmonious blending and fine-tuning of the passions, however, brings out an interesting adaptation on Plutarch's part of both Platonic and Aristotelian descriptions of moral virtue, an adaption that serves as an example of Plutarch's own creative interpretation in the realm of ethical philosophy. At the same time, it also serves as an example that illustrates how Plutarch sees his own view as part of the unified Academy and as a faithful adaptation in line with Platonic philosophy, which I will discuss below in §VII.

In both *On Moral Virtue* and *Platonic Questions* 9, Plutarch appeals to the metaphor of musical harmony to explain his conception of moral virtue in the soul. The definition of virtue that Plutarch formulates with this metaphor is not limited to those works; it recurs throughout his *Moralia* and informs his discussion of virtues in the *Lives*.[80] As to the view itself, the description

[80] Plutarch's view of moral virtue as a mean state of passions occurs throughout his works. I discuss notable descriptions of this conception below in quotations from *On Moral Virtue*, *Platonic Questions* 9, *On Moral Progress*, and *Beasts are Rational*. The same formula for moderating emotions also occurs for passions that do not qualify as virtues, such as shame (*On Compliancy* 529A7–9). For a similar argument that shame must be moderated in Aristotle's works, though it is not a proper virtue when moderate see Raymond 2017. On Plutarch's description of

of virtue as a harmonious state strikes some accord with the Stoic notion of virtue as an appropriate tension (τόνος) of soul.[81] Unlike the Stoics, however, Plutarch argues that the harmony of virtue exists *between* the rational and non-rational parts of the soul; it is not the tension of a monistic, uniform soul.[82] Plutarch's theory of virtue is not monotone, as it were, but instead is more in tune with Plato's view of justice as a form of harmonized inner dynamics among the different parts of the soul.

Note Plutarch's allusions to the mean of internal harmony between the rational and non-rational parts of the soul in the *Republic*'s description of justice:

[T33] γίνεται δὲ μεσότης καὶ λέγεται μάλιστα τῇ περὶ φθόγγους καὶ ἁρμονίας ὁμοίως· ἐκείνη τε γὰρ ἐμμελὴς οὖσα φωνὴ καθάπερ ἡ νήτη καὶ ὑπάτη τῆς μὲν τὴν ὀξύτητα τῆς δὲ τὴν βαρύτητα τὴν ἄγαν διαπέφευγεν· αὕτη τε κίνησις οὖσα καὶ δύναμις περὶ τὸ ἄλογον, τὰς ἐκλύσεις καὶ τὰς ἐπιτάσεις καὶ ὅλως τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον ἐξαιρεῖ τῆς ὁρμῆς, εἰς τὸ μέτριον καὶ ἀναμάρτητον καθιστᾶσα τῶν παθῶν ἕκαστον.

> The *mean* comes about and is especially said to be a mean because it is like the mean in music and *harmony*. For the mean in harmony, being a musical sound in tune, like the *highest* and the *lowest sounds*,[83] avoids the excessive sharpness of the high notes and the excessive lowness of the low notes. Likewise, virtue, being itself a movement and power concerned with the non-rational, removes the weaknesses and over-exertions and the

---

moral virtue and the harmony within the political community in the *Lives* see *Numa* 3.6–7; *Timoleon* 3.5; *Dion* 52.6; *Brutus* 1.3; *Marius* 2.1; *Coriolanus* 15.4; *Lycurgus* 7.1, 7.5; *Lycurgus and Numa* 4.15; *Pericles* 3.2, 15.1–2; *Aemilius* 4.4; *Philopoemon* 8.3; *Pelopidas* 19.2; *Galba* 1.3. For discussion of these passages in the *Lives* see Duff 1999, pp. 89–94.

[81] Philo, *Allegories of the Laws* 2.22–3=*SVF* 2.458=LS 47P; Origen, *On Principles* 3.1.2–3=*SVF* 2.988=LS 53A. See Gill 2006, pp. 230–8.

[82] Drawing on *Phaedo* 92a6–95a3, Plutarch argues that the soul is not itself a harmony, but its constituents are disposed harmonically (*On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1013C6–D4).

[83] The "lowest string" (νήτη) is highest in pitch, while the "highest string" (ὑπάτη) is lowest in sound. Cf. Plutarch *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1021A1–7: "It is possible even now to prove the truth [of the preceding conclusions about the octave] by attaching unequal weights to two strings or making one of two *auloi* pipes, which are equal in their hollowed cavities, twice as long as the other. For, of the two *auloi* pipes, the longer one will make a lower sound as the 'highest' (ὑπάτη) to the 'lowest' (νήτη), and of the strings, the one stretched by twice the weight of the other will will make a higher sound as the 'lowest' (νήτη) to the 'highest' (ὑπάτη)" (ἔξεστι δὲ καὶ νῦν βασανίσαι τὸ ἀληθές, ἢ βάρη δυεῖν ἄνισα χορδῶν ἐξαρτήσαντας ἢ δυεῖν ἰσοκοίλων αὐλῶν τὸν ἕτερον μήκει διπλάσιον τοῦ ἑτέρου ποιήσαντας· τῶν μὲν γὰρ αὐλῶν ὁ μείζων βαρύτερον φθέγξεται ὡς ὑπάτη πρὸς νήτην, τῶν δὲ χορδῶν ἡ τῷ διπλασίῳ κατατεινομένη βάρει τῆς ἑτέρας ὀξύτερον ὡς νήτη πρὸς ὑπάτην).

excesses and deficiencies of impulse altogether, bringing each of the passions into a *moderate* and unerring state. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444E9–445A2)[84]

[T34] συναρμόσαντα τρία ὄντα, ὥσπερ ὅρους τρεῖς ἁρμονίας ἀτεχνῶς, νεάτης τε καὶ ὑπάτης καὶ μέσης, καὶ εἰ ἄλλα ἄττα μεταξὺ τυγχάνει ὄντα, πάντα ταῦτα συνδήσαντα καὶ παντάπασιν ἕνα γενόμενον ἐκ πολλῶν, σώφρονα καὶ ἡρμοσμένον.

[The just person] brings the internal parts of the soul that are three in number *together in harmony*, just as though they were simply three limits of *harmony* in a scale, the *lowest*, *highest*, and *middle*, and, if there are really other parts between these, he binds all of them together to become from many parts wholly one, both moderate and *harmonious*. (Plato, *Republic* 4, 443d5–e2)[85]

In Plutarch's descriptions, as in this passage and the definition of moderation (σωφροσύνη) in the *Republic* (4, 431c9–432b1), virtue occurs when the non-rational and rational functions are harmoniously related.[86] Unlike the musical metaphor in the *Republic*, Plutarch's analysis extends deeper, making the very passions of the non-rational parts of the soul, as it were, strings whose melodious tune depends on getting the correct measure and tension, neither excessive in length, nor too short (*On Moral Progress* 84A5–10; *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008E3–1009B2).[87] Plutarch brings the discussion closer now to the doctrine of the mean in Aristotle's ethical philosophy.[88]

In moving beyond the internal dynamics between the parts of the soul to the very functions of the non-rational parts themselves, Plutarch applies the concept of an appropriate

[84] Cf. Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* 9, 1007E6–9: "Concerning the capacities of the soul in Plato's *Republic* (namely, [T33]), where Plato likens the harmonious joining of the rational, spirited, and appetitive parts in an excellent way to the harmonious joining of the *middle*, *highest*, and *lowest sounds*…" (περὶ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεων ἐν Πολιτείᾳ Πλάτωνος τὴν τοῦ λογικοῦ καὶ θυμοειδοῦς καὶ ἐπιθυμητικοῦ συμφωνίαν ἁρμονίᾳ μέσης καὶ ὑπάτης καὶ νήτης εἰκάσαντος ἄριστα…).
[85] Cf. *Republic* 4, 430c8–432b6. On harmony in Plato's *Republic* see Gill 1985, pp. 12–15 and 21–4.
[86] Cf. *Timaeus* 89e3–90a2: "Just as we have often said, three types of soul are housed in us in three regions, and each has its own motions…we must take care that they have motions that harmonize with one another" (καθάπερ εἴπομεν πολλάκις, ὅτι τρία τριχῇ ψυχῆς ἐν ἡμῖν εἴδη κατῴκισται, τυγχάνει δὲ ἕκαστον κινήσεις ἔχον…φυλακτέον, ὅπως ἂν ἔχωσι τὰς κινήσεις πρὸς ἄλληλα συμμέτρους).
[87] Cf. *On Moral Virtue* 449F2–4.
[88] See n. 2 above. Cf. Babut 1969a, pp. 72–80 and 153–6, nn. 100–20; Opsomer 2004, pp. 150–2; 2012, p. 326–8.

amount of passion that is itself moderate, not just part of a moderate and harmonious structure of the soul. Each passion must be contained within certain limits:

[T35] οὕτως δ' [ὁ πρακτικὸς λόγος, B10] ὁρίζων τὴν παθητικὴν κίνησιν ἐμποιεῖ τὰς ἠθικὰς ἀρετὰς περὶ τὸ ἄλογον, ἐλλείψεως καὶ ὑπερβολῆς μεσότητας οὔσας.

> In this way, [practical reason, i.e. the rational part of the soul] imposing limits upon the movement of the affective faculty, produces the moral virtues in the non-rational part of the soul, which are mean states between deficiency and excess.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444C6–9)

In giving appropriate boundaries to the passions, the rational part of the soul brings the non-rational passions into their own normative states. Plutarch calls these states stable dispositions (ἕξεις), using Aristotelian terminology,[89] which are included within the overall stable disposition of a virtuous soul (*On Moral Virtue* 443D1–10).

Now, suppressing passions as far as possible might be the goal if our non-rational passions were inactive or defunct and if the optimal relation of the non-rational parts of soul to reason consisted in a neutralized state of passions with reason solely operative. But, Plutarch's image of harmony indicates that passions and the passionate parts of the soul *contribute* to the harmony of the soul, like the different notes that comprise a harmonious symphony of sound. The notion that the non-rational parts of the soul contribute to the harmonious blending in the *Republic* may be implied, but Plutarch's adaptation is far more explicit.[90]

---

[89] *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.4–6; 3.5; 5.1, 1130a10–13; 6.1–7.1; 8.5, 1157b5–6; 10.6, 1176b26–7. Cf. *Eudemian Ethics* 2.1–5; 3.10, 1227b5–11; 7.13, 1246b32–6. Cf. also Aristotle, *Metaphysics* Δ 20, 1022b10–14: "A stable disposition is said to be a disposition according to which what is disposed is either well or badly disposed, also either according to itself or in relation to something else, just as health is a kind of stable disposition. For a disposition is that kind of thing. Moreover, it is called a stable disposition if it is a part of such a disposition. For this reason, the excellence of parts is a kind of stable disposition" (ἕξις λέγεται διάθεσις καθ' ἣν ἢ εὖ ἢ κακῶς διάκειται τὸ διακείμενον, καὶ ἢ καθ' αὑτὸ ἢ πρὸς ἄλλο, οἷον ἡ ὑγίεια ἕξις τις· διάθεσις γάρ ἐστι τοιαύτη. ἔτι ἕξις λέγεται ἂν ᾖ μόριον διαθέσεως τοιαύτης· διὸ καὶ ἡ τῶν μερῶν ἀρετὴ ἕξις τίς ἐστιν). Cf. also Rodrigo 2011, p. 8 for further discussion of this passage. Cf. also Oele 2012, p. 351, n. 2.

[90] Each part of the soul may contribute, as each class of the City of Speech, by doing its own part and not interfering with the tasks of the other parts (4, 432e4–436b4). However, it might still be possible for the rational part of the soul to exert its influence so that it micromanages the rest of the soul. We could imagine the harmony among the parts to

Following through with the Aristotelian understanding of moral virtue,[91] moreover, Plutarch argues that moral virtues *require* that passions be in the right amount:

[T36] [τοῦ λόγου] ἀλλ' ὅρον τινὰ καὶ τάξιν ἐπιτιθέντος αὐτῷ [τῷ πάθει] καὶ τὰς ἠθικὰς ἀρετάς, οὐκ ἀπαθείας οὔσας ἀλλὰ συμμετρίας παθῶν καὶ μεσότητας, ἐμποιοῦντος.

> But [reason] imposes a certain limit and arrangement upon [passion] and produces within it the moral virtues, which are not devoid of passion, but are mean, harmonious states of the passions. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 443C10–D1)

Taking [T36] together with [T35], the mean, harmonious states of passions are not devoid of passion (οὐκ ἀπαθείας οὔσας, 443C11), because they are not *deficient* in passion, admitting the correct amount between the extremes of deficiency and excess (ἐλλείψεως καὶ ὑπερβολῆς μεσότητας οὔσας, 444C8–9). There is a proper *amount* of passion required in moral virtue. Here Plutarch also more explicitly expresses that passions, not merely the passionate parts of the soul, are a *sine qua non* for moral virtue. The rational part of the soul produces moral virtue *in* the passions, not when passions are defunct or suppressed as far as possible, but rather in a moderate state that is not without passion. The goal is not the neutralization of passions, as though the non-rational movements of our passions must be inert for the appropriate means of moral virtues to obtain.

When our passions are too weak, in fact, the rational part of the soul must incite and rekindle them to bring them back to their appropriate level of activity:

[T37] τοῦτ' οὖν τοῦ πρακτικοῦ λόγου κατὰ φύσιν ἔργον ἐστί, τὸ ἐξαιρεῖν τὰς ἀμετρίας τῶν παθῶν καὶ πλημμελείας. ὅπου μὲν γὰρ ὑπ' ἀρρωστίας καὶ μαλακίας ἢ δέους

---

be an agreement that the rational part of the soul will pull all of the strings, as it were, in the passionate parts of the soul, commandeering and working on its own to meet all of the body's needs. The rational part of the soul might itself produce the harmonious sound of the soul, like a ventriloquist projecting from the passions as though they were its own puppets. I explore these notions further in Chapters 3, 4, and the Appendix to Chapter 4. For the puppeteer metaphor see Plato, *Phaedo* 94b4–e6 and *Laws* 1, 644d7–645b1.

[91] Cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.6, 1106b36–1107a3. I will discuss Plutarch's nearly identical formulation of moral virtue as a mean below in §VII.

> καὶ ὅκνου προενδίδωσιν ἡ ὁρμὴ καὶ προαπολείπει τὸ καλόν, ἐνταῦθα πάρεστιν ἐξεγείρων καὶ ἀναρριπίζων· ὅπου δὲ πάλιν ἐκφέρεται ῥυεῖσα πολλὴ καὶ ἄτακτος, ἐκεῖ τὸ σφοδρὸν ἀφαιρεῖ καὶ ἵστησιν.
>
> This, then, is the natural function of practical reason, namely, to remove immoderate and disharmonious states of the passions. For, where the impulse gives up too early and falls short with respect to what is virtuous due to weakness and softness or fear and hesitancy, there practical reason is present, inciting and rekindling the impulses of our passions, while where, in turn, the impulse of passion is borne along in a mighty and disorderly deluge, there practical reason removes the excess and brings it to a halt.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444B10–C6)

It is not the case, then, that non-rational parts of the soul must merely be present and brought into accord with reason for moral virtue. The harmony that Plutarch envisions is not solely concerned with the proper relations of rule and guidance between the rational and non-rational parts of the soul. The non-rational parts of the soul and their passions must be contained within proper limits so that they *contribute* to the overall harmonious activity of the soul.

In turning an eye to the states of passion within the harmonious soul, then, Plutarch alters the requirements and idealization of moral virtues from the Platonic picture we saw developing in §I and §III. Contrary to advice to suppress grief as far as possible in the *Republic*, and possibly all passions, based on what appears to be a negative evaluation of emotions in Plato's *Timaeus*, *Republic*, and *Phaedo*, the doctrine of the mean applied to individual passions requires the *right amount* of emotional response, even for painful emotions such as grief (*Consolation to Apollonius* 102D6–7).[92]

[92] Again, I am not claiming here that Plutarch holds that there is a virtue of grief, but as with other passions, excluding those that are excessive or entirely inappropriate, it should be moderated. See nn. 38 and 80 above and n. 109 below. On the moderation of appetites see also *Table-Talk* 663D5–7: "You could say that a healthy diet is not an avoidance nor an escape from pleasure, but instead is a moderation and arrangement that uses obedient desire for what is beneficial" (φαίης ἂν οὐ φυγὴν οὐδ' ἀπόδρασιν ἡδονῆς εἶναι τὴν ὑγιεινὴν δίαιταν, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἡδονὰς μετριότητα καὶ τάξιν ὑπηκόῳ χρωμένην ὀρέξει τοῦ συμφέροντος).

Having the right among of passion, moreover, means *feeling* passions to the right extent in appropriate situations. The state (ἕξις) of passion involved in moral virtue incorporates the *movement* of the passions (τὴν παθητικὴν κίνησιν), which are the activities of the non-rational parts of the soul and what we typically refer to as passions (τὰ πάθη), such as the passion of anger (ὀργή, 443D6–7). Our passions are brought into order, within their own limits, and made to fit within the optimal order of the psychic parts in the soul, but they are not halted as proper activities of our non-rational parts. The non-rational movements of passions (κινουμένων ἀλόγως τῶν παθῶν) are preserved in the state of moral virtue (*Platonic Questions* 9, 1009B5–8);[93] they are harnessed, as it were, to fitting ends (*On Moral Virtue* 450E6–F1).[94] Moral virtue, in fact, *requires* that the capacities to feel passions and the movements of the passions (αἱ παθητικαὶ δυνάμεις καὶ κινήσεις) be brought into proper limits (*On Moral Virtue* 451F5–452A1).

Plutarch goes so far as to say that the end-product of moral virtue is impulse *with passion*:

[T38] τὴν δ' ὁρμὴν τῷ πάθει ποιεῖ τὸ ἦθος, λόγου δεομένην ὁρίζοντος, ὅπως μετρία παρῇ καὶ μήθ' ὑπερβάλλῃ μήτ' ἐγκαταλείπῃ τὸν καιρόν.

[93] "The faculty of reason, taking hold of the passions that move non-rationally and fitting them together about itself into a moderate proportion between deficiency and excess, establishes the mean" (ἡ τοῦ λόγου δύναμις ἀντιλαμβανομένη κινουμένων ἀλόγως τῶν παθῶν καὶ συναρμόττουσα περὶ αὑτὴν εἰς τὸ μέτριον ἐλλείψεως καὶ ὑπερβολῆς μεσότητα καθίστησι). Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.7, 1107a33; Stob. 2.7.20. For the co-occurrence and often synonymous use of measure and mean see pseudo-Platonic *Definitions* 415a4–6: "'moderate': what is between excess and deficiency and suffices according to skill. 'measure': what is between excess and deficiency'" (μέτριον τὸ μέσον ὑπερβολῆς καὶ ἐλλείψεως καὶ κατὰ τέχνην ἀρκοῦν. μέτρον τὸ μέσον ὑπερβολῆς καὶ ἐλλείψεως); Cf. also Roskam 2011, p. 184. *Pace* Boys-Stones 2013, pp. 129–33, I take Plutarch's doctrine of moderation in the *Consolation to Apollonius* as moving away from the picture of the *Phaedo* and the goal of purging our passions. Cf. Becchi 1999.

[94] See n. 63 above for the quotation.

> Moral virtue[95] produces impulse with passion. This impulse needs reason to give it boundaries, so that the impulse may be present to the right degree, not going to excess nor failing in deficiency for the critical moment. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444B1–4)

As we will discuss further in Chapter 3, the rational part of the soul cannot create passion of its own accord and dispense with the non-rational parts of the soul. Instead, reason harnesses the non-rational activity of our passions that arise from the non-rational parts of soul and brings them into their optimal, moderate states, preserving their activity and guiding it.

§VI Moral Virtue and the Harmony of Bodily Humors

In addition to musical harmony, Plutarch also draws upon the notion of the harmonious state of health in the body to describe moral virtue.[96] Plutarch conceives of the healthy state of the soul as analogous to the healthy state of the body. In a kind of harmonious relationship, the different bodily humors must be in correct proportions relative to one another. When they become disproportionate, the body enters a diseased condition:

[T39] οἷον γὰρ ἐν φθόγγοις μουσικὴ τὸ ἐμμελὲς οὐκ ἀναιρέσει βαρύτητος καὶ ὀξύτητος, ἐν δὲ σώμασιν ἰατρικὴ τὸ ὑγιεινὸν οὐ φθορᾷ θερμότητος καὶ ψυχρότητος, ἀλλὰ συμμετρίαις καὶ ποσότησι κραθεισῶν ἀπεργάζεται, τοιοῦτον ἐν ψυχῇ τὸ ἠθικὸν[97] ἐγγενομένης ὑπὸ λόγου ταῖς παθητικαῖς δυνάμεσι καὶ κινήσεσιν ἐπιεικείας καὶ μετριότητος. οἰδοῦντι γὰρ ἔοικε καὶ φλεγμαίνοντι σώματι τὸ περιαλγοῦν καὶ περιχαρὲς καὶ περίφοβον τῆς ψυχῆς, οὐ τὸ χαῖρον οὐδὲ τὸ λυπούμενον οὐδὲ τὸ φοβούμενον.

> Just as the musical art produces harmony that is in tune, not by the removal of low and high notes in sound, and the medical art produces a healthy state of being, not by the cessation of heat and cold but by the harmonious proportions and quantities of heat and cold mixed together in bodies, likewise moral virtue in the soul [is produced] when a

[95] I have not provided the context leading up to this passage here, but Plutarch has just distinguished intellectual from moral virtues and now discusses the latter. I take up this passage and the division of virtues in more detail in Chapter 3, §I.

[96] On the use of the theory of bodily humors in Plutarch's conception of harmony see Duff 1999, pp. 89–94, esp. p. 93. On Plutarch's understanding of medical theories see Tsekourakis 1989 and Boulogne 1996. On the medical theory used to describe the moderation of passions see Ingenkamp 1971, pp. 90–8. Cf also Van Hoof 2010, pp. 211–54.

[97] Following Camerarius' reading here, which is confirmed by MS G and makes sense of the passage as a return to moral virtue with the analogy.

> suitable and moderate condition comes about in the passionate capacities and activities due to reason. For excessive pain, excessive joy, and excessive fear of the soul are like a body that is swollen and inflamed, but not [simply] feeling joy, feeling pain, and feeling fear. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451F2–452A3).[98]

Through the metaphor of the harmony of bodily humors, Plutarch again indicates that passion cannot be removed entirely but must be blended into a correct mixture with other passions by reason, like the balanced internal fluids of the body that constitute the health of the body.

This understanding of health and disease of the soul is directly opposed to the Stoic thought that passions are themselves diseased states of the soul. Unlike the Stoics, Plutarch does not hold all passions to be states of excess. Plutarch even contrasts his own position on passionate impulses with the Stoic definition of passion as an excessive impulse (ὁρμὴ πλεονάζουσα),[99] by arguing that although passionate impulses *can* be excessive and deficient (*On Moral Virtue* 444E7–9),[100] moral virtue comes about when the impulse of passion is present in a suitable and moderate condition (ὁρμὴ μετρία, 444B1–4=[T37]).

With this view of harmony, health, and the moderation of the passions in mind, I want to address a point of confusion in Plutarchean studies before we move on to the question of how Plutarch understands his own view as part of the unified Academic tradition (§VII). Some have worried that Plutarch wavers between the ideal of ἀπάθεια and that of μετριοπάθεια in his moral philosophy, taking Plutarch's not infrequent descriptions of passions as diseases within the soul as evidence for the ideal of ἀπάθεια.[101] Plutarch's phrase of "passions and diseases" (πάθη

---

[98] Cf. *On Brotherly Love* 478F7–479B5; *Advice on Keeping Well* 129B–C; *Table-Talk* 685C.

[99] For the Stoic notion that every passion is an impulse that is excessive (ὁρμὴ πλεονάζουσα) see Stob. 2.7.10 =*SVF* 3.378=LS 65A; Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 441C10–D3, 449C3–7. On passions as in themselves diseased states for the Stoics see Seneca, *Letters* 85.3–5, 116.1; Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.13–31, 61–3; *SVF* 3.444 and 3.447. Cf. Frede 1986; Nussbaum 1994, p. 389; Irwin 1998, p. 223; and Sorabji 2000, pp. 207–9.

[100] Moral virtue as a mean "is not entirely devoid of passionate impulses, among which is excess and deficiency" (οὔτ' ἀπήλλακται παντάπασι τῶν παθητικῶν ὁρμῶν, ἐν αἷς τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττόν ἐστι).

[101] Cf. Dillon 1983 and 2016; Nikolaidis 1991, pp. 169–70; Spanneut 1994, pp. 4704–11. Cf. also Machek 2018 and n. 105 below.

καὶ νοσήματα / νόσοι) recurs in numerous passages and has led some to form the view that Plutarch changes his mind or never really made up his mind on whether passions are in themselves negative and to be suppressed or more neutral and in need of moderation.[102]

Admittedly, when Plutarch discusses vices and the unhealthy condition of the soul, he often does not explicitly state that these diseased states of the passions are diseased insofar as they are excessive. Nevertheless, it is my contention that these passages should be read with the view of health described in [T39]; the metaphor of the harmonious bodily humors disambiguates what some have taken to be either contradictory remarks,[103] or inconsistencies of thought.[104] And so, although Plutarch often does not further qualify that by the phrase "passion and disease," he means immoderate passion, Plutarch's critical remarks about passions consistently describe *immoderate*, *excessive* passions as diseased states, not passions wholesale, as Francesco Becchi has demonstrated.[105] To the evidence that Becchi provides, I would add that Plutarch also

---

[102] *On Listening to Lectures* 38C4–D6, 43D5–8; *How to Tell a Friend from a Flatterer* 60D5–E6, 71A8–B1; *On Moral Progress* 76A3–7; *On Virtue and Vice* 101A10–B2, 101C3–9; *On Superstition* 165A7–B3, C8–11; *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 413B6–9; *On the Control of Anger* 455B4–8; *On Tranquility of Mind* 468B8–C1; *On Affection for Offspring* 497C9–D8; *Whether the Affections of the Soul are Worse Than Those of the Body* 500D5–8, 501C5–D6, 504E11–F2; *On Compliancy* 532C9–D5; *On Envy and Hate* 536E2–6, 537E2–7; *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 561C11–D9; *Table-Talk* 717D10–E2, 731B10–11, 731C6–D4; *Whether "Live Unknown" is a Wise Precept* 1128D–E; *Dion* 11.3; *Aemilius Paullus* 8.10; *Sulla* 13.2; *Aratus* 52.4. Cf. *On Love*=Sandbach frr. 134–36 (Stob. 4.20.34 and 4.20.68). On the medical analogy applied to excessive passions or toward passions viewed as diseases from Plato's works, among different Hellenistic schools, and through to Neoplatonic writers, see Annas 1992, pp. 19–36; Nussbaum 1994, *passim*; Becchi 1999; Sorabji 2000, pp. 17–28; White 2008, pp. 292–6, esp. nn. 50–2; Malherbe 2014, esp. pp. 123–34 and n. 13. Cf. also Fitzgerald 2008a (pp. 11–12), who discusses Galen's, Maximus of Tyre's, and Plutarch's discussion of passions as diseases; Ingenkamp 1971, who focuses on Plutarch's therapeutics for disorderly passions; Van Hoof 2007, who focuses on different therapeutic strategies in Seneca's and Plutarch's works.

[103] Nikolaidis 1991, pp. 169–70.

[104] Spanneut 1994, pp. 4701–11. Cf. Sorabji 2000 (p. 196), who follows Spanneut's argument and accordingly categorizes Plutarch as one who wavers between ἀπάθεια and μετριοπάθεια.

[105] Becchi 1999 (esp. pp. 38–43), 2005, 2014 (pp. 78–85). Cf. Boys-Stones 2017, p. 486. See, for instance, Plutarch, *On Rage*=Sandbach fr. 148=Stob. 3.20.70: "Those who apply anger as the ally of virtue ⟨are most successful⟩, taking as much advantage of it as they can in war and, by Zeus, in politics, ⟨while being eager⟩ to remove and cast out from the soul the greater part of it and its excess, which is called wrath, bitterness, and short-temperedness, diseases least appropriate for courageous souls" (⟨κατορθοῦσι δὲ μάλιστα⟩ οἱ παραδεξάμενοι τὸν θυμὸν ὡς σύμμαχον ἀρετῆς, ἀπολαύοντες ὅσον αὐτοῦ χρήσιμόν ἐστιν ἔν τε πολέμῳ καὶ νὴ Δί' ἐν πολιτείαις, τὸ πολὺ δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ἐπιπολάζον ⟨σπουδάζοντες⟩ ἐκκρίνειν καὶ ἐκβάλλειν τῆς ψυχῆς, ὅπερ ὀργή τε καὶ πικρία

consistently describes the remediation from diseased states of the soul as a return to moderate passions, not the removal or complete suppression of passions *in toto*.[106] This is not to say that *every* passion is to be moderated. Like Aristotle,[107] Plutarch recognizes that passions such as envy (φθόνος) have no part in the virtuous life (*On Listening to Lectures* 39D8–10).[108] They are themselves diseased extremes of other passions that admit of moderate states. These diseased forms, as it were, sprout off on their own like weeds (39E8–11).[109]

καὶ ὀξυθυμία λέγεται, νοσήματα ἥκιστα ταῖς ἀνδρείαις ψυχαῖς πρέποντα, accepting Sandbach's emendations, which are marked in angle brackets). Becchi's argument also disambiguates passages in which Plutarch seems to praise the lack of passion in certain individuals. These individuals have moderated their passions. Their lack of excessive passions is what is being praised, not a complete absence of passions. See n. 32 above. Machek 2018, whose article I have come across only recently, has renewed the argument that passions appear at times to be bad in themselves. Machek believes that Plutarch *may* be inconsistent or uncritical in his own views. I think that the arguments I explore here show that Plutarch is consistent in his view that passions are not bad in themselves.

[106] See, for instance, *On Moral Progress* 84A1–12: "For just as the diversions of diseases into less important parts of the body are not a bad sign, so even the vice of those who are making progress seems, by transforming into more suitable passions, to be blotted out little by little. The ephors [at Sparta] asked Phrynis, after he stretched two strings next to the seven [of the lyre], whether he desired to allow them to cut off those at the top or the bottom. But ours require a lopping off around the top and the bottom [of the passions] if we intend to settle into the mean and moderate position. And progress remits the excesses and sharpness of passions first" (καθάπερ γὰρ αἱ τῶν νόσων εἰς τὰ μὴ κύρια μέρη τοῦ σώματος ἐκτροπαὶ σημεῖόν εἰσιν οὐ φαῦλον, οὕτως ἡ κακία τῶν προκοπτόντων ἔοικεν εἰς ἐπιεικέστερα πάθη μεθισταμένη κατὰ μικρὸν ἐξαλείφεσθαι. Φρῦνιν μὲν γὰρ οἱ ἔφοροι ταῖς ἑπτὰ χορδαῖς δύο παρεντεινάμενον ἠρώτων πότερον τὰς ἄνωθεν ἢ τὰς κάτωθεν ἐκτεμεῖν αὐτοῖς ἐθέλει παρασχεῖν· ἡμῶν δὲ δεῖται μέν πως τὰ ἄνω καὶ τὰ κάτω περικοπῆς, εἰ μέλλομεν εἰς τὸ μέσον καθίστασθαι καὶ μέτριον· ἡ δὲ προκοπὴ τὰς ὑπερβολὰς πρότερον καὶ τὰς ὀξύτητας τῶν παθῶν ἀνίησι); *On Listening to Lectures* 46E1–47A10: Young men must receive criticism correctly, lest they harbor diseased passions like a sick patient who flees from a doctor (φεύγων τὸν ἰατρὸν, 46E11) and the words of warning that wound begin a process of healing (ὁ τρώσας λόγος ἰᾶται, 47A2); *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 551D4–8: The noble part (τὸ γενναῖον) of souls can give bloom to vice that is contrary to nature when corrupted, but "if this nobility in some is well attended to medically, it takes back its fitting stable disposition" (θεραπευθὲν ἐνίοις καλῶς ἀπολαμβάνει τὴν προσήκουσαν ἕξιν). Cf. *On Being a Busybody* 520D3–7.

[107] *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.6, 1107a8–15.

[108] "Envy combined with malignity and enmity" (φθόνος τοίνυν μετὰ βασκανίας καὶ δυσμενείας) "when it is present, is not a good thing for any deed, but rather is an impediment to everything noble" (οὐδενὶ μὲν ἔργῳ παρὼν ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐμπόδιος τοῖς καλοῖς). Cf. Plutarch, *On Envy and Hate* 537C7–8: Envy never arises justly against anyone (τὸ μὲν φθονεῖν πρὸς οὐδένα γίνεται δικαίως).

[109] Envy (φθόνος) results from an inappropriate desire for repute and unjust desire for honor (ἐκ φιλοδοξίας ἀκαίρου καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἀδίκου). The desire for honor (φιλοτιμία), however, is a passion that should itself be moderated (*Precepts of Statecraft* 820A2–B1; *Alexander* 17.1–2; *Coriolanus* 1.5; cf. Duff 1999, pp. 83–7 and 2008, p. 14). In *On Love*, Sandbach frr. 134–6 (Stob. 4.20.34 and 4.20.68), Plutarch also recognizes that perverted forms of ἔρως must be suppressed if not entirely removed. Again, this does not indicate that every instance of ἔρως is bad or diseased. Plutarch goes on to say that some are very good, such as the ἔρως that underlies friendship (φιλία, Sandbach fr. 135). Cf. also Plutarch's descriptions of unnecessary desires, which draw upon *Republic* 9 (571b2–572b6): *On Virtue and Vice* 100F9–101B, *On Moral Progress* 83A4–B8, *On the Sign of Socrates* 584D9–F4.

§VII Plutarch, Aristotle, and the Unified Academy

Many have noticed that Plutarch's conception of moral virtue looks heavily inspired by Aristotle.[110] Plutarch's general formula of moral virtue as a mean is highly reminiscent of what we find in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, where the mean is given its boundaries or limits by reason (ὡρισμένη λόγῳ) and is a "mean between two vices, one according to excess, the other according to deficiency" (μεσότης δὲ δύο κακιῶν, τῆς μὲν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δὲ κατ' ἔλλειψιν, 2.6, 1106b36–1107a3). Plutarch even uses the same qualification in how we speak of virtue as both a mean and an extreme (ἀκρότης). Virtue, Plutarch writes,

[T40] ἀκρότης μέν ἐστι τῇ δυνάμει καὶ τῇ ποιότητι, τῷ ποσῷ δὲ μεσότης γίνεται τὸ ὑπερβάλλον ἐξαιροῦσα καὶ τὸ ἐλλεῖπον.

> is an extreme in its power and quality, but it becomes a mean in quantity, removing what is excessive and what is deficient. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444D7–9)

Though Plutarch does not quote Aristotle verbatim, this qualification nevertheless looks as though it has been pulled straight from Aristotle's doctrine of the mean in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (2.6, 1107a6–8).[111]

Note also the similarities between Plutarch's definitions of courage (ἀνδρεία), the moderation of desires (σωφροσύνη), and liberality (ἐλευθεριότης) and those given succinctly in a single passage from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (2.7, 1107a33–b10). Like Aristotle, Plutarch, after describing moral virtue as a mean, begins with the example of courage:

---

[110] Babut 1969a, esp. pp. 72–80 and 153–6, nn. 100–20; Dillon 1977, pp. 193–6; Gill 2006, pp. 233–8; Ferrari 2008, pp. 154–7. Cf. Beneker 2012: The ethical system in Plutarch's *On Moral Virtue* "is fundamentally the same as that described by Aristotle" (p. 16).

[111] "According to its substances and the account of what it is said to be essentially, virtue is a mean, but according to what is best and is good, it is an extreme" (κατὰ μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸν λόγον τὸν τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι λέγοντα μεσότης ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρετή, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἄριστον καὶ τὸ εὖ ἀκρότης). Plutarch also seems to allude to Aristotle (*Nicomachean Ethics* 2.6, 1106b27–9) in his remark that we can err in many ways to vice but achieve success in virtue in only one way (*On Moral Virtue* 444B6–10).

[T41] αὐτίκα τὴν μὲν ἀνδρείαν μεσότητά φασιν εἶναι δειλίας καὶ θρασύτητος, ὧν ἡ μὲν ἔλλειψις ἡ δ' ὑπερβολὴ τοῦ θυμοειδοῦς ἐστιν.

For example, they say that courage is a *mean* between *cowardice* and *over-boldness*. The former of these is a *deficiency* and the latter an *excess* of the spirited part of the soul.
(Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 445A2–5).[112]

[T42] περὶ μὲν οὖν φόβους καὶ θάρρη ἀνδρεία μεσότης· τῶν δ' ὑπερβαλλόντων ὁ μὲν τῇ ἀφοβίᾳ ἀνώνυμος (πολλὰ δ' ἐστὶν ἀνώνυμα), ὁ δ' ἐν τῷ θαρρεῖν ὑπερβάλλων θρασύς, ὁ δ' ἐν τῷ μὲν φοβεῖσθαι ὑπερβάλλων τῷ δὲ θαρρεῖν ἐλλείπων δειλός.

Therefore, courage is the *mean* concerned with fear and confidence. Of those who are excessive, the one who exceeds in fearlessness does not have a name (and many are without names) while the one who *exceeds* in confidence is *bold*, and the one who exceeds in feeling fear and *is deficient* in confidence is a *coward*.
(Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.7, 1107a33–b4)[113]

Again, Plutarch is not quoting Aristotle, but the definition of the moderate state is not only verbally similar but also looks conceptually derivative. Plutarch's example of liberality (ἐλευθεριότης) as the mean between stinginess (μικρολογία) and wastefulness (ἀσωτία, *On Moral Virtue* 445A4–5) also looks directly drawn from this same passage, which lists the extremes of wastefulness and stinginess (ἀσωτία καὶ ἀνελευθερία, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.7, 1107b8–10).[114] The term for stinginess is different, but the definition is essentially the same. The same is true for the moderation of desires (σωφροσύνη), which is "always bringing the desires into a moderate state between insensitivity (ἀναισθησία) and lack of restraint (ἀκολασία)" (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 445A8–10).[115] For this virtue, the mean and two diametrically

[112] Cf. *On Tranquility of Mind* 474C–D.
[113] Cf. *ibid*. 2.8, 1109a8–10; 3.5–9; *Eudemian Ethics* 2.3, 1220b39, 1221a17–19; 3.1, 1228a30–b3.
[114] Cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* 4.1; *Eudemian Ethics* 2.3, 1221a5.
[115] εἰς τὸ μέσον ἀναισθησίας καὶ ἀκολασίας ἀεὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας καθιστᾶσαν. Accepting Pohlenz's deletion of ἀπαθείας after μέσον. Cf. Plutarch, *Beasts are Rational* 989B5–8: "Moderation (ἡ σωφροσύνη), then, is a certain narrowness and arrangement of desires, removing those that are introduced from without and excessive and arranging those that are necessary at the critical moment and in a mean state" (ἡ μὲν οὖν σωφροσύνη βραχύτης τίς ἐστιν ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ τάξις, ἀναιροῦσα μὲν τὰς ἐπεισάκτους καὶ περιττὰς καιρῷ δὲ καὶ μετριότητι κοσμοῦσα τὰς ἀναγκαίας).

opposed vices are given the same names by Plutarch as we find in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.7 (1107b4–8).[116]

Given these similarities, we might wonder whether Plutarch appropriates or merely copies parts of Aristotle's ethical theory and sets it to the tune of the Platonic image of bringing the soul's parts into harmony.[117] Since even Aristotle writes that the appetitive element of a moderate individual should be *in harmony* with reason (δεῖ τοῦ σώφρονος τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν συμφωνεῖν τῷ λόγῳ, 3.11, 1119b15–16), should we classify Plutarch as essentially Aristotelian in his view of moral virtue, even if he fits more with Platonic views in his metaphysics and epistemology?[118]

As I noted in the Introduction,[119] Plutarch would not view himself as Aristotelian here and Platonic there. He sees his view as part of the living tradition of the Platonic Academy. This living tradition includes Aristotle as a member and his works as part of Platonic philosophy. Plutarch believes that Aristotle's followers departed further from the core tenets of the Platonic Academy than Aristotle ever did.[120] He also believes that Aristotle is by and large a faithful and

[116] Moderation of desires (σωφροσύνη) is the mean concerned with pleasures and pains. The excess is lack of restraint (ἀκολασία) and those who are deficient are called insensitive (ἀναίσθητοι). Cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* 3.10–11, 1117b23–1119b21 and 7.4, 1147b20–1148b14.

[117] Pinnoy 1973; Donini 1974, esp. pp. 64–5, 80–1; 1986, esp. p. 216; Becchi 1975, p. 180; 1978, pp. 193–8; 1981, pp. 279–80; 1990, p. 33; 2014; Dillon 1983; and Beneker 2012, p. 16. Becchi argues that Plutarch appropriates the Aristotelian notion of virtue to use against his Stoic opponents, calling this "functional Aristotelianism" (*Aristotelismo funzionale*). For further discussion of these types of views and for further citations see Opsomer 1994, pp. 33–6; 2012, pp. 15–17; and Gill 2006, p. 230.

[118] Cf. *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus*, *Platonic Questions* 1, *On the Principle of Cold* 995C, and *Reply to Colotes* 1122A–1124B, where Plutarch claims that his own views are derived from Plato's and the Platonic Academy's metaphysics and epistemology. Plutarch also makes clear that he believes Aristotle to have departed too far from aspects of Plato's metaphysics, for which see n. 122 below. On Plutarch's epistemology see Opsomer 1998, pp. 190–212; Brittain 2001, pp. 225–36.

[119] See §IV–§V in the Introduction.

[120] *Reply to Colotes* 1115B–C. Cf. Karamanolis 2006, p. 97. See also n. 40 of the Introduction.

good interpreter of Platonic philosophy,[121] even if he at times is incorrect in his own views.[122] In certain cases, however, Aristotle is taken to be more systematic in his explication of the best views that Platonism has to offer.[123]

When we look more closely at the elements Plutarch blends together in his description of moral virtue as a harmonious mean, we find that Plutarch is not simply copying Aristotle's model. Even in the specific virtues of courage, moderation of desires, and liberality, which look very similar to the definitions in *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.7, Plutarch seems to have specific passages from Plato's *Republic* in mind. In the *Republic*'s image of the inner human, lion, and many-headed beast, when the lion, which represents the spirited part of the soul (τὸ θυμοειδές) is strengthened beyond its limits:

[T43] ἡ δ' αὐθαδία καὶ δυσκολία ψέγεται οὐχ ὅταν τὸ λεοντῶδές τε καὶ ὀφεῶδες αὔξηται καὶ συντείνηται ἀναρμόστως;
πάνυ μὲν οὖν.
τρυφὴ δὲ καὶ μαλθακία οὐκ ἐπὶ τῇ αὐτοῦ τούτου χαλάσει τε καὶ ἀνέσει ψέγεται, ὅταν ἐν αὐτῷ δειλίαν ἐμποιῇ;

Are not stubbornness and peevishness censured whenever they increase and strain the parts that are like a lion and a snake out of tune?
Very much so.
And are not daintiness and weakness censured for the relaxing and slackening of this very part, whenever it produces *cowardice* in it? (Plato, *Republic* 9, 590a10–b4)

[121] Karamanolis 2006 goes so far as to say that Plutarch "considered Aristotle to be in a way a preserver of Platonic doctrines," (p. 87) and that Aristotle's arguments often were "representative of Plato's own doctrines" (p. 89).
[122] Plutarch notes that Aristotle rejected Plato's Theory of Forms and Plato's view on the composition of the world (*Reply to Colotes* 1114F–1115C; cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.6, 1096a11–1097a14; *Metaphysics* A 9, N 1–9; *On the Heavens* 280a28–32, 283a4–284a2, 300b16–19). Plutarch is also careful to distinguish Aristotle's views from Platonic tenets when his Epicurean or Stoic opponents lump them together (*Reply to Colotes* 1114F–1115C; *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* 1086E–F; *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1040D–E, 1041A). Cf. Karamanolis 2006, pp. 85–126, esp. pp. 88, 92–100.
[123] Plutarch often draws upon Aristotle for his more scientific arguments in natural philosophy, such as in *On the Principle of Cold*. Cf. Plutarch, *Nicias* 23.5. Cf. also Teodorsson 1999; Karamanolis 2006, pp. 86–9; Becchi 2014, p. 77.

Daniel Babut suggests that Plutarch draws on this passage in his description of courage because Plutarch assigns courage to the spirited part of the soul (τὸ θυμοειδές).[124] The point is not systematized or formulated as the doctrine of the mean that Aristotle presents, but it expresses two extremes of excess and deficiency, naming the state of cowardice as the deficiency, though stubbornness (αὐθαδία) stands in place of Aristotle and Plutarch's boldness (θρασύτης) and bold individual (θρασύς). It is also possible that Plutarch has the *Republic* in mind in his definition of liberality, wherein the two extremes to be avoided in one's liberality, are described as stinginess (ἀνελευθερία) and wastefulness (ἀσωτία, *Republic* 8, 560c6–561a4).[125]

The virtue of moderating desires (σωφροσύνη), however, is far more Aristotelian in formulation. As we have already seen, moderation in Plato's *Republic* is not itself applied to produce a mean state among the desires of the appetitive part of the soul, but instead describes the correct relationship of the appetitive part in being subdued and under the power of the rational part of the soul (4, 431c9–432b1). Nevertheless, even here it is likely that Plutarch believes that Aristotle has come to the best view on moderation too. A view that he would describe as part of the Platonic tradition.

Plutarch expresses his own allegiance to truth rather than dogma in several places,[126] but nowhere so pointedly as in his attack on Stoic ethics:

[T44] ἀλλ' ὀρθῶς μὲν εἴρηται τὸ
πρὸς στάθμῃ
πέτρον τίθεσθαι, μή τι πρὸς πέτρῳ στάθμην.[127]

[124] Cf. Babut 1969a, p. 154, n. 104. Cf. Etheridge 1961, p. 143.
[125] Cf. Babut 1969a, p. 154, n. 105.
[126] Cf. *Platonic Questions* 1. Cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 91b–c; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.6, 1096a11–15.
[127] For the proverbial expression, cf. Arsenius, *Sayings* (88a) in Leutsch and Schneidewin, *Corpus paroemiographorum Graecorum* vol. 2, p. 625. Cf. also LSJ, s.v. στάθμη, §I.2.

> οἱ δὲ μὴ τιθέμενοι τὰ δόγματα πρὸς τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀλλὰ τὰ πράγματα πρὸς τὰς ἑαυτῶν ὑποθέσεις ὁμολογεῖν μὴ πεφυκότα καταβιαζόμενοι πολλῶν ἀποριῶν ἐμπεπλήκασι τὴν φιλοσοφίαν.
>
> But correctly has it been said,
>
> "Place the stone
> Straight with the measuring line, not the measuring line with the stone."
>
> But those who do not align their teachings with the facts but instead try to force the facts unnaturally to agree with their own assumptions have filled philosophy with many puzzles. (Plutarch, *On Moral Progress* 75F4–9)

Plutarch rails against the Stoics, whom he views as the greatest transgressors in this regard (75F9–76B6), but his remarks also reveal a self-conscious attempt on his own part to confront areas in which interpretations of reality and ethics, even if these interpretations are held to be core tenets or dogmas of Platonic philosophy, must align with reality and not just tradition.

This point is brought out in Plutarch's arguments on grief, which we explored in §II above. Although I was not very explicit on the point earlier, Plutarch need not conceive of his own position as incompatible with Plato's overall view or the Platonic tradition itself, even when his own arguments on moderating grief are in direct opposition to the arguments in Plato's *Republic*. Instead, Plutarch seems to think that his predecessor in the Platonic Academy, Crantor, got the essential Platonic idea right, unlike the view that seems to have prevailed among the earliest members of the Academy, which Aristotle opposed with his doctrine of moderating the passions. We might say that, for Plutarch, Crantor got the Platonic view right because he saw the position that was most compatible with reality itself and with Plato's philosophy overall. Plutarch's approach to the moderation of passions in general follows the same pattern.[128] As I

[128] Although I do not have space to discuss it here, Plutarch also implicitly argues against the criticisms of poetry in *Republic* 2–3 and 10, in his *How a Young Man Should Read Poetry*, arguing that poetry is useful and helpful for moral progress. I discuss this point briefly in Chapter 5, §IV, but the topic deserves a longer exploration in a project to follow. In brief, my own view is that Plutarch's defense of poetry against the psychological criticisms of *Republic* 10, where Socrates argues that poetry feeds the lower parts of the soul and makes them unruly against the rational part of the soul, follows from Plutarch's view that moral virtue is a harmony between moderated passions and

note in the Introduction, Plutarch sees Aristotle as part of the Platonic tradition. In the field of ethics and psychology, Plutarch draws heavily upon Aristotelian ideas to explicate what he believes to be the correct view of the role that passions play in moral virtue.[129]

Even when Plutarch's own arguments directly oppose what we find in the *Republic*, he can still appeal to other passages in Plato's dialogues to support what he believes to be the better view. I noted above that a few more positive interpretations within Plato's dialogues are possible, especially in the view of the passionate parts of the soul and their positive contribution to moral progress and intellectual development in the *Phaedrus*. I also noted that Plutarch seems to appeal to the image of shared identity through shared feelings in *Republic* 5. As we will see in Chapter 3, Plutarch draws on the *Phaedrus*' Myth of the Charioteer frequently and interprets the more positive evaluation of the passions as in line with this strand of Platonic philosophy. Together with Aristotle's ethical philosophy, this more positive view of the incitement and motivation of the passions for virtue informs his view on the moderation of the passions.

Plutarch's tendency to read Plato's discussions on passions more positively is evident also in his use of the metaphor of musical harmony and the harmony among bodily humors. In the metaphor of musical harmony, Plutarch highlights the notion that each of the lower parts of the soul contributes to virtue as each tone contributes to and is part of the harmony in music. The same notion that passions contribute to the virtue of justice can be inferred from the definition of justice in the *Republic*, where each part does its own job, not meddling with the other parts, just as the different individuals in the three classes of the city do their own jobs and do not interfere

---

reason, not a mastery of passion that requires passions to be relatively weak, and Plutarch's view that students can learn to discriminate and keep their own passions from becoming inordinate. Cf. Neumayr 1963 and 1964; Zadorojnyi 2002; and Blank 2011.

[129] Cf. *On Moral Virtue* 442B–C.

with the work of the others (4, 432e4–436b4). But again, the idea that the passions contribute to virtue in a positive sense, beyond being mastered and subdued is not very explicit in the *Republic*. Reading Aristotle's doctrine of the mean into the metaphor of musical and bodily harmony, however, Plutarch argues that each of the parts of the soul contribute to moral virtue, and he holds Aristotle's view to be compatible with the Platonic view of moral virtue.

And so, although Plutarch draws heavily upon Aristotle in explaining his own view that passions must be moderated for moral virtue, he still considers his own interpretation to be rooted in a Platonic tradition that extends back to Plato and is perhaps even foreshadowed by Pythagoras.[130] This becomes more apparent when we pay attention to *how* Plutarch frames his own view, beginning with the overall division of the soul into its parts. Concerning the basic division between the rational and non-rational parts of our soul,

[T45] εἰκὸς μέν ἐστι μηδὲ Πυθαγόραν ἀγνοῆσαι, τεκμαιρομένοις τῇ περὶ μουσικὴν σπουδῇ τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἣν ἐπηγάγετο τῇ ψυχῇ κηλήσεως ἕνεκα καὶ παραμυθίας, ὡς οὐ πᾶν ἐχούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ καὶ μαθήμασιν ὑπήκοον οὐδὲ λόγῳ μεταβλητὸν ἐκ κακίας, ἀλλά τινος ἑτέρας πειθοῦς συνεργοῦ καὶ πλάσεως καὶ τιθασεύσεως δεόμενον, εἰ μὴ παντάπασι μέλλοι φιλοσοφίᾳ δυσμεταχείριστον εἶναι καὶ ἀπειθές· ἐμφανῶς μέντοι καὶ βεβαίως καὶ ἀναμφιδόξως Πλάτων συνεῖδεν, ὅτι τούτου τε τοῦ κόσμου τὸ ἔμψυχον οὐχ ἁπλοῦν οὐδ' ἀσύνθετον οὐδὲ μονοειδές ἐστιν…ἥ τ' ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴ μέρος ἢ μίμημα τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὖσα καὶ συνηρμοσμένη κατὰ λόγους καὶ ἀριθμοὺς ἐοικότας ἐκείνοις οὐχ ἁπλῆ τίς ἐστιν οὐδ' ὁμοιοπαθής, ἀλλ' ἕτερον μὲν ἔχει τὸ νοερὸν καὶ λογιστικόν, ᾧ κρατεῖν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ φύσιν καὶ ἄρχειν προσῆκόν ἐστιν, ἕτερον δὲ τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἄλογον καὶ πολυπλανὲς καὶ ἄτακτον ἐξεταστοῦ δεόμενον.

it is likely that not even Pythagoras was unaware [of this], if we judge by the sign of the man's zeal for music, which he applied to the soul for the sake of bewitching and assuaging it,[131] on the grounds that not all of the soul is subject to teaching and lessons nor changeable from vice through reason, but that part of it needs some other helpful persuasion and molding and taming, if it is not going to be entirely hard-to-manage and disobedient to philosophy. Plato, however, clearly, firmly, and without a hint of doubt comprehended that the ensouled part of this universe is not simple, nor is it without

[130] See nn. 134 and 140–2 below.
[131] Cf. Plato, *Euthydemus* 290a.

> composition, nor singular in form[132]…and the soul of man, which is a part and imitation of the whole and is fitted together according to proportions and fitting numbers with those [of the universe],[133] is not something simple nor alike in its affections, but has one part, intelligible and rational, which naturally is fit to rule over and lead the human individual, but it has another part, the passionate and non-rational, which is prone to wander and to disorder and needs an overseer.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 441E1–442A5)

Plutarch takes the adumbrations of Pythagoras as signs that he was coming to the right view about the composition of the soul and how moral virtue comes about through the proper moderation and management of the soul. Plutarch, however, thinks that Plato is far clearer in his understanding, since he comprehends the nature of the soul "clearly, firmly, and without a hint of doubt" (ἐμφανῶς καὶ βεβαίως καὶ ἀναμφιδόξως). Here we get a hint of Plutarch's notion that Plato improved upon and more clearly understood the truth of the view that was, as it were, seminally contained within the Pythagorean notion of musical harmony between the different parts of the soul.[134]

The same trend continues also with what *prima facie* seems to be a rather odd appropriation of Aristotle's hylomorphism in the relationship between the rational and non-rational parts of the soul. In the opening remarks of *On Moral Virtue*, Plutarch formulates moral virtue (ἡ ἠθικὴ ἀρετή) as having passion as its matter and reason as its form (τὸ μὲν πάθος ὕλην ἔχειν τὸν δὲ λόγον εἶδος, 440D2–3). This looks to be an adaptation of the notion that the soul and passions form a kind of hylomorphic substance.[135]

---

[132] Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 35a–37c.
[133] Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 69c–72d.
[134] Cf. Bellanti 2003 and 2007, who argues that Plutarch blends the Platonic and Pythagorean notions of musical harmony with the doctrine of the mean in Aristotle.
[135] On Aristotle's hylomorphic formulation as explaining the relationship between form, matter, and change, cf. *Physics* 195a6-8; *Metaphysics* H 6, 1045a26–9. On soul-body hylomorphism see *On the Soul* 2.1, 412a20, b5–7, 413a1–3; 2.2, 413a20–21, 414a3–9, 15–18. Cf. Witt 1989; Johnstone 2006.

When we look more closely at how Plutarch frames his discussion of moral virtue with the relationship between reason and the passions, however, we find that Plutarch situates this formula within an essentially Platonic system. As both Jan Opsomer and Daniel Babut have convincingly argued,[136] Plutarch's notion that the soul is the form that inheres in the passions draws upon Plutarch's larger schema in which the function of the rational part of the soul that brings limit and arrangement to the passionate part of the soul is patterned on the imposition of limitation and form in the cosmic soul,[137] which Plutarch sees at work in Plato's *Timaeus* 35a2–3 and *Laws* 896d5–898c8.[138] The human soul is a microcosm and imitation of the world-soul.[139] Plutarch also takes this to be foreshadowed by Pythagoras (*On Isis and Osiris* 370D3–371A4),[140] even if it is more likely to be of pseudo- or neo-Pythagorean origin,[141] or more a part of the Platonic tradition attributed to Pythagoras.[142]

---

[136] Babut 1969a, pp. 69 and 129, n. 1; 1969b, pp. 298–301, 316–17, 321–33; Opsomer 1994, pp. 44–9; 2005, p. 181–2, 190; 2012, pp. 325–30. Cf. Dillon 1977, pp. 192–6; Dirlmeier 1983, pp. 292–4. Cf. also Gill 2006, p. 230, 234; Ferrari 2008, pp. 14–53. Cf. *On Moral Virtue* 446D–E.

[137] Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444B10–C6=[T37], 443C10–D1=[T36], 444B1–4=[T38], 444C6–9=[T34], 446D, and 449B. Cf. *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1013A, 1014C, 1025A.

[138] Plutarch mentions both the *Timaeus* and the *Laws* in this connection in *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1014D, 1015A. Plutarch also alludes to *Phaedrus* 245c5–246a2 in 1015A. Cf. Opsomer 2012, p. 327: Plutarch "does not really regard moral virtue as some kind of hylomorphic substance or structure in the Aristotelian sense. If anything, we have hylomorphism in a Platonic fashion, in which a superior principle imparts form upon an underlying matter…being the faithful Platonist he is, Plutarch will certainly have understood his hylomorphist remark as being in perfect agreement with the moral psychology of the *Timaeus* and *Republic*." On Plutarch's view that the application of "limit" to passion is of Platonic and Pythagorean origin, drawing on Plato's *Philebus* 24a–30b, see Dillon 1977, pp. 2–4 and 196; Opsomer 2004, pp. 150–2. Cf. Opsomer 1994, pp. 44–5.
See also Plutarch's allusion to Aristotle's *Categories* as in line with the overall division of soul in the cosmos as well as in a human being (*On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1023E).

[139] Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 441E8–442A5; *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1023D10–E7, 1025A–D, 1026D; *On the Face in the Moon* 943A6–7; cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 69c5–d1=[T29]. Cf. also Baltes 2000, pp. 257–8, and 2005, p. 88; Dillon 2001b, pp. 37–40; Opsomer 2012, pp. 311–15.

[140] Plutarch situates both Plato and Aristotle in a tradition on the nature of the soul that goes back to Pythagoras. Cf. Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights* 4.11, who claims that Plutarch found Pythagorean teachings in Aristotle's works. Cf. also Karamanolis 2006, p. 87, n. 9.

[141] See, for instance, Metopus, *On Virtue* 117.5–14, 117.28–118.6, 119.8, 17–18 Thesleff; Theages, *On Virtue* 190.8–26 Thesleff. Cf. Dillon 1977, pp. 117–21, 126–9, 341–83; Centrone 1990, p. 197; Bellanti 2007, p. 230.

[142] Cf. Jones 1916, pp. 14–16; Donini 1974, pp. 92–105; 1999; 2011; Centrone 1990, pp. 204–5; 2000, esp. pp. 560, 567–75; Opsomer 2005, pp. 188–99; 2012, p. 326; Ferrari 2008; Dillon 2010b. On Plutarch's presentation of Numa as influenced by Pythagoreanism see Liebert 2016, pp. 175–84. As both Burkert 1972 and Centrone 1990 and 2000 well demonstrate, it is unclear to what extent "Pythagorean" doctrines stem from a Pythagorean tradition and are not

For Plutarch, the core tenets of Plato's Academy, whether they stretch back to the Pythagorean tradition or are best formulated in Aristotle's works, are subject to reinterpretation and modification if they fail to fit with reality. In *Platonic Questions* 1, Plutarch, drawing on the metaphor of Socrates' midwifery in the *Theaetetus* (150b6–151a5), argues that we cannot be so attached to our own ideas that we fail to see their inadequacies. In *Reply to Colotes*, Plutarch also advises caution in forming attachments to beliefs that could turn out to be false (1121E8–1122F5).[143] Plutarch believes that a strand of healthy skepticism runs throughout the entire history of Plato's Academy, from Socrates up to his own time, and is an integral part of the Platonic approach to truth, even in Aristotle's dialectical method.[144] Built into the Platonic tradition, then, is a kind of skeptical corrective meant to guard against dogmatically holding to false beliefs. The plumb-line by which one's view is judged is not Plato, his dialogues, or so-called dogmas that many have thought dominate Middle Platonic thinkers, but truth. Plutarch just happens to think that Plato generally got things right, or at least set us on the right path, with the right method, to find the truth, or at least our best approximation of it.

---

themselves Platonic. Burkert argues that Pythagoras himself was likely more a guru than a philosopher, though Plato and the Platonic tradition tended to attribute their own views to Pythagoras. Cf. Boys-Stones 2001, pp. 118–20. On Plutarch's association with Pythagoreans see Hershbell 1984. On Plutarch's view that Pythagoras foreshadowed Platonic views of the soul and virtue see Opsomer 2012, p. 320, n. 50. Cf. also Horky 2013; Laks and Most 2016, "Pythagoras, Pythagoreans, and Pythagoreanism: Reception" in their Loeb edn. of *Early Greek Philosophy. Vol. IV: Western Greek Thinkers*, *Part 1*, pp. 336–8 and pp. 372–91 (R28–R34).

[143] See Opsomer 1998, pp. 127–62, for an extended and detailed account of Plutarch's defense of Socrates and the caution of the aporetic tradition used in the search for truth. Cf. Karamanolis 2006, pp. 85–9; Kechagia 2011, pp. 305–11.

[144] See §IV in the Introduction and the accompanying notes. Cf. Karamanolis 2006, pp. 85–6: "Plutarch forcefully argues that the sceptical interpretation of Plato, far from being a distortion of Plato's philosophy…does justice to the aporetic spirit of this philosophy. For Plutarch, though, this aporetic spirit remains compatible with Plato's doctrinal aspect. This is because for him scepticism amounts to a way of searching out the truth, that is, the dialectical methodology of arguing on either side of a question in order to adduce without prejudices where the truth lies. This neither amounts to a dogmatic denial of the possibility to know, nor does it mean that no conclusion can be reached in this process. Rather, Plutarch believed that Plato had often reached such conclusions and held specific doctrines.…There is evidence to suggest that Plutarch perceived Aristotle's accord with Plato's philosophy partially through Aristotle's adherence to his aporetic spirit."

***

Plutarch defends the naturalness and usefulness of grief against the arguments we find in Plato's *Republic*, but he would not see his own position as inconsistent with the Platonic Academy's ethical philosophy. In his defense of moderate passions as essential to moral virtue, Plutarch draws upon Aristotle's doctrine of the mean, but blends it with other metaphorical descriptions of virtue in Platonic cosmology and psychology. In his defense of the passions, Plutarch argues not only that passions must be moderated (μετριοπάθεια), but also that they are useful and contribute to the morally virtuous life.

CHAPTER 3

Spirit and Love: Enhancing Action

"He works with passion, zeal, and enthusiasm!" Unless one's actions and passions are grossly misdirected, we tend to think of acting with passion as a good thing. We work harder and feel a greater sense of accomplishment and pride if we are passionate about our work. As in the *Republic*'s definition of courage (4, 442b10–c2), passion can provide strong motive force in our actions, so strong that at times it helps us endure hardships and pains in pursuit of noble ends.

It emerged from the last chapter that certain passages from Plato's *Timaeus*, *Republic*, and *Phaedo* can be read as giving a rather low estimation of our passions and our passionate nature. Passions are frequent sources of error and look to be little more than a pollution of the rational part of our soul, our true human nature. But that is not the only picture we find in Plato's dialogues, as I mentioned in Chapter 2, nor is it the picture that Plutarch draws upon to establish his own more positive view of passions in the moral and good life. In this chapter, we will explore several positive contributions that passions can make to life, some of which Plutarch draws from Plato's dialogues and expands upon in developing his own view that passions are not only necessary aspects of the embodied life, but also enhance it.

In the first part of this chapter (§I), we will look at the necessity of passion for action and Plutarch's division of intellectual and moral virtues. For Plutarch, the rational part of the soul is in itself inert and incapable of initiating practical actions on its own. Reason's own peculiar activity of contemplation concerns intellectual objects that are eternal and unchangeable, and the

virtue of contemplation is intellectual, not moral. If we are to act in the world, however, we can only do so if the non-rational passionate parts of the soul are involved, since they provide impulse as a necessary ingredient for initiating practical action. Moral virtue involves a partnership between the rational and the passionate parts of the soul (§I)

To illustrate the contribution of passions for motivation, Plutarch depicts passions as the "Wind in Our Sails." As in the *Phaedrus*' Myth of the Charioteer, the rational part of the soul guides our actions, while the passions provide propulsion (§II). In the final sections of this chapter we will explore several aspects of life that Plutarch believes are improved by the presence and development of our passions. Passions enhance certain activities. Drawing on Plato's *Timaeus*, Plutarch writes that the gods have added passions to human nature to provide it with its own source of motivation (§III). Passions also aid in our pursuit of moral progress. They can intensify virtuous actions (IV). They additionally can provide an incitement to virtue (ὑπέκκαυμα τῆς ἀρετῆς) through the desire for honor and engender a longing for virtue. Most emphatically, Plutarch argues that we would not choose to be without passions even if we could. Passions make life *better* (§VII).

§I Passion, Practical Action, and The Division of Virtues

As we saw in the previous chapter, passions are necessary as an ingredient of moral virtue. One must cultivate dispositions to act and to feel in the right way and in the right amount if one is to be morally virtuous. As we will explore in this section, Plutarch argues that our need for passions is even deeper. Passions provide impetus for practical action in the embodied life. We need them not only for virtuous actions, but also for any action that we are to undertake in our current earthly condition. Passions are necessary for *all* practical action in this life and without them we cannot act.

First, I should note that Plutarch does not hold the view that no activity of the soul is possible without the passions. In *On Moral Virtue*, Plutarch describes purely rational activities, such as the activity of contemplation, which do not involve passions and are free from their influence:

[T46] ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν ἀπροσδεὴς τοῦ ἀλόγου καὶ περὶ τὸν εἰλικρινῆ καὶ ἀπαθῆ νοῦν συνισταμένη σοφία[1] αὐτοτελής τίς ἐστιν ἀκρότης τοῦ λόγου καὶ δύναμις, ᾗ τὸ θειότατον ἐγγίνεται τῆς ἐπιστήμης καὶ μακαριώτατον.

> But one kind of virtue, wisdom, arising without need of the non-rational and being concerned with pure intellect free from passion, is a kind of self-sufficient excellence and capacity of reason in which the most divine and most blessed of knowledge comes to be.
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444C10–D3)

The intellectual virtue of wisdom (σοφία) is an activity of pure intellect that is free from the influence of passions (νοῦς καθαρὸς καὶ ἀπαθής, *On the Sign of Socrates* 588D9–10).[2] It also, as in Aristotle's division, is distinguished from moral virtues that involve passion, and this division can be understood in terms of the different types of objects one cognizes.[3] The

---

[1] I follow Helmbold in deleting καὶ φρόνησις after σοφία. It makes little sense to think that practical wisdom is impractical and purely theoretical as the passage would read if καὶ φρόνησις were retained, especially considering what Plutarch has to say in 444A3–B1=[T47]. See also Babut 1969a, p. 152, n. 92.

[2] In *On the Sign of Socrates*, Plutarch lauds the flawless intellectual virtue of Socrates based on the fact that his intellect is free of passions (νοῦς καθαρὸς ὢν καὶ ἀπαθής, 588D9–10). Cf. Plutarch, *On Moral Progress* 83E–84B. I take it that this kind of virtue is what Plutarch proleptically mentions at the beginning of *On Moral Virtue* when he writes, "For I suppose that it is clear that virtue can come about and persist entirely without matter and unmixed with it" (ὅτι μὲν γὰρ δύναται καὶ ἀρετὴ γεγονέναι καὶ μένειν παντάπασιν ἄυλος καὶ ἄκρατος, οἶμαι δῆλον εἶναι, 440D9–E1). As we saw in the last chapter, moral virtue requires passions, which come about in embodiment. As we will see shortly, intellectual virtue does not require passions, nor does it require embodiment for Plutarch.

[3] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 6.1, 1139a6–15: "Let there be two parts that have reason, one with which we contemplate the sort of entities whose principles are not able to be otherwise, another by which we contemplate things that can be otherwise. For of the parts of the soul, one naturally differs in kind from another in relation to the objects that differ in kind, if indeed knowledge belongs to things according to likeness and kinship. Let one of these be called scientific, the other, calculative, since to deliberate is the same as to calculate and no one deliberates about things that are not able to be otherwise. Consequently, the calculative is one part of what has reason" (καὶ ὑποκείσθω δύο τὰ λόγον ἔχοντα, ἓν μὲν ᾧ θεωροῦμεν τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ὄντων ὅσων αἱ ἀρχαὶ μὴ ἐνδέχονται ἄλλως ἔχειν, ἓν δὲ ᾧ τὰ ἐνδεχόμενα· πρὸς γὰρ τὰ τῷ γένει ἕτερα καὶ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μορίων ἕτερον τῷ γένει τὸ πρὸς ἑκάτερον πεφυκός, εἴπερ καθ' ὁμοιότητά τινα καὶ οἰκειότητα ἡ γνῶσις ὑπάρχει αὐτοῖς. λεγέσθω δὲ τούτων τὸ μὲν ἐπιστημονικὸν τὸ δὲ λογιστικόν· τὸ γὰρ βουλεύεσθαι καὶ λογίζεσθαι ταὐτόν, οὐδεὶς δὲ βουλεύεται περὶ τῶν μὴ ἐνδεχομένων ἄλλως ἔχειν. ὥστε τὸ λογιστικόν ἐστιν ἕν τι μέρος τοῦ λόγον ἔχοντος). I translate δύο τὰ λόγον ἔχοντα as "two parts that have reason" based on the division of parts of the soul μόρια τῆς ψυχῆς of contemplative and deliberative reason in a9–10. Cf. also *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1103a1–

intellectual virtue of wisdom turns its gaze only toward objects that are eternal and cannot be otherwise than they are; it is not concerned with items that can be otherwise, i.e. are not stable and admit of change or are subject to chance:

[T47] ὁ θεωρητικὸς νοῦς περὶ τὰ πρῶτα καὶ μόνιμα καὶ μίαν ἀεὶ φύσιν ἔχοντα μὴ δεχομένην μεταβολὰς ἐνεργῶν ἀπήλλακται τοῦ βουλεύεσθαι.

> Theoretical intellect has its activity free from deliberation and concerns first principles that are stable and have an eternal nature not admitting of changes. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444A3–6)

Like Aristotle,[4] Plutarch calls this form of contemplation scientific and theoretical (ἐπιστημονικὸν καὶ θεωρητικόν) when we cognize only things that are absolute, eternal, and unchanging in nature and do not take into consideration things that can be otherwise (*On Moral Virtue* 443E6–7).[5]

When we think about things that do admit of change and can be related to us in different ways,[6] however, we use what Plutarch calls, in alignment with Aristotle again, deliberative and practical reason:

[T48] τὸ δ' ἐν τοῖς πῶς ἔχουσι πρὸς ἡμᾶς βουλευτικὸν καὶ πρακτικόν· ἀρετὴ δὲ τούτου μὲν ἡ φρόνησις ἐκείνου δ' ἡ σοφία. διαφέρει δὲ σοφίας φρόνησις, ᾗ τοῦ θεωρητικοῦ πρὸς τὸ πρακτικὸν καὶ παθητικὸν ἐπιστροφῆς καὶ σχέσεώς τινος γενομένης ὑφίσταται κατὰ λόγον ἡ φρόνησις.

> [When considering] things that are in a certain relation to us, it is deliberative and practical. The virtue of the latter is practical wisdom while [the virtue] of the former [which considers things that are absolute, eternal, and unchanging (E6–7)] is wisdom. Practical wisdom differs from wisdom insofar as practical wisdom subsists according to reason when a turn and certain relation of contemplative reason to practical action and passion occurs. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 443E8–F2)

10; 3.3, 1112a21–6, b1; 6.1, 1139a6–14; 6.5, 1140a31–3; 6.8, 1142a11–13; 10.7, 1177b3–3, 10.8, 1178b8–33, 1179a22–32; *Politics* 7.14, 1333a24–5. Cf. Babut 1969a, p. 152, n. 93.

[4] See the preceding note.

[5] Reason when cognizing "only things that hold absolutely is scientific and contemplative" (τὸ μὲν περὶ τὰ ἁπλῶς ἔχοντα μόνον ἐπιστημονικὸν καὶ θεωρητικόν ἐστι).

[6] On the similarity of Plutarch's terminology to Stoic terminology here see Babut 1969a, pp. 12–13. As Babut notes (pp. 48–9), Plutarch's formulation is also in line with the terminology of both Xenocrates and Andronicus.

Now we are introduced to reason's interaction with passion. While the intellectual virtue of wisdom (σοφία) is not concerned with passions or the objects that we deliberate about, practical reason, and its excellence, practical wisdom (φρόνησις), turn their attention toward them.[7]

Plutarch writes that practical reason descends, as it were, to the level of contingent affairs,[8] and it must interact with both the practical and non-rational aspects of our nature to produce practical action:

[T49] τὴν δὲ φρόνησιν εἰς πράγματα πλάνης μεστὰ καὶ ταραχῆς καθιεῖσαν ἐπιμ(ε)ίγνυσθαι τοῖς τυχηροῖς πολλάκις ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι καὶ τῷ βουλευτικῷ χρῆσθαι περὶ τῶν ἀδηλοτέρων, τῷ δὲ πρακτικῷ τὸ βουλευτικὸν ἐκδεχομένην ἐνεργεῖν ἤδη καὶ τοῦ ἀλόγου συμπαρόντος καὶ συνεφελκομένου ταῖς κρίσεσιν. ὁρμῆς γὰρ δέονται· τὴν δ' ὁρμὴν τῷ πάθει ποιεῖ τὸ ἦθος.

> Practical wisdom often enters into practical affairs that are full of error and confusion and deals with elements of chance out of necessity; it makes use of the deliberative faculty concerning matters that are not clear; and then, taking up where the deliberation ends, it must operate with the practical faculty in its judgments, with the non-rational part also giving its aid and being drawn along together with it. For impulse is needed, and moral virtue produces impulse with passion. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444A6–B1)

Here we see that practical reason uses deliberation to determine a course and set an appropriate end for action. Reason alone, however, even in its deliberative capacity, is insufficient to initiate action. In order for practical action to begin, reason calls upon the powers of the practical faculty to issue a judgment and passion to aid and join together in (συμπαρεῖναι καὶ συνεφέλκεσθαι) the production of action. What does passion provide? An impulse to act (ὁρμή).

The final line in this quotation indicates that it is *with passion* that moral virtue produces an impulse. By this, Plutarch means that it is by means of passion that impulse comes in to initiate action.[9] As indicated here and in *Reply to Colotes*, impulse is necessary for practical

[7] On the distinction between σοφία and φρόνησις in Aristotle see *Nicomachean Ethics* 6.5–8, 1140a24–1142a30.
[8] Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 27d5–28a6 and 52a4–7.
[9] Cf. Babut 1969a, p. 151, n. 87, who also takes this to be an instrumental dative, which is supported by the instrumental service attributed to passions in *On Moral Virtue* 444D4–7=[T51].

action and is the movement and conveyance of the soul (ἡ ὁρμή, κίνησις οὖσα καὶ φορὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, 1122C9–D1).[10] If we are to move our bodies at all, these movements must be initiated by impulse (*On the Sign of Socrates* 588F7–589A10).[11] But, the rational part of the soul does not produce impulse *without passion*.

When we reason about contingent affairs, such as what end we are to pursue and what course of action we are to take, the matter may be decided upon by a purely rational procedure (*On Moral Virtue* 447F1–4). At the end of deliberation and planning, however, something more than thought alone is required to put an action into motion.[12] Practical actions require impulse (ὁρμῆς γὰρ δέονται, 444B1), which the passionate part of our nature provides. Passions and the non-rational parts of the soul, in fact, provide impulse to action even without planning and deliberation, as is evident among non-rational animals (*On Moral Virtue* 450F1–451B1).

In a passage near the end of *On Moral Virtue*, Plutarch writes that impulses to action, which concern corporeal objects (πρὸς τὰ σωματικά) and practical actions, arise due to the formation of the passionate parts of the soul when the soul mixes with the body (450E7–F1).[13] The rational part of the soul, however, which remains separate and distinct from the passionate

[10] "For practical action needs two things, the representation of what is fitting and impulse toward what is apparently fitting, neither of which is in conflict with suspension [of belief and assent]" (ἡ γὰρ πρᾶξις δυοῖν δεῖται, φαντασίας τοῦ οἰκείου καὶ πρὸς τὸ φανὲν οἰκεῖον ὁρμῆς, ὧν οὐδέτερον τῇ ἐποχῇ μάχεται).
[11] Plutarch draws upon the image of the puppeteer from Plato's *Phaedo* (94b4–e6) and *Laws* 1 (644d7–645b1) in this passage. What reason decides upon gains an impulse to action by touching the strings, as it were, of the passionate part of the soul in its connection with the body. Cf. also *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men* 163E–F.
[12] Cf. Aristotle, *On the Soul* 3.10, 433a22–3: "Intellect evidently does not initiate motion without desire" (ὁ μὲν νοῦς οὐ φαίνεται κινῶν ἄνευ ὀρέξεως); *Nicomachean Ethics* 6.2, 1139a29–34. See also n. 22 below.
[13] "The non-rational part of the soul is naturally like the body and shares in its affections and is influenced by them, after it has sunk into it and commingled with it. This is clear from the impulses that rise up and are moved *toward corporeal objects*, receiving their intensity and abatement with the changes of the body" (τοῦ ἀλόγου τοῦ τὴν γένεσιν αὐτόθεν ἔχοντος ἐκ τοῦ σώματος, ᾧ καὶ συνεξομοιοῦσθαι καὶ κοινωνεῖν παθῶν καὶ ἀναπίμπλασθαι πέφυκεν, ἐνδεδυκὸς αὐτῷ καὶ καταμεμιγμένον, ὡς δηλοῦσιν αἱ ὁρμαὶ πρὸς τὰ σωματικὰ κινούμεναι καὶ ἱστάμεναι καὶ σφοδρότητας ἐν ταῖς τοῦ σώματος μεταβολαῖς καὶ ἀνέσεις λαμβάνουσαι). Most of the MSS have καί after τοῦ ἀλόγου, but I follow MS Φ in printing τοῦ, along with Dumortier and Defradas in the Budé edition and Helmbold in the Loeb edition.

part of the soul,[14] does not affect the body or initiate any action unless passion and the passionate parts of the soul are involved:

[T50] ὅταν δὲ μὴ μετὰ πάθους ἀλλ' αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτὸ κινῆται τὸ διανοητικόν, ἡσυχίαν ἄγει τὸ σῶμα καὶ καθέστηκεν οὔτε κοινωνοῦν οὔτε μετέχον αὐτὸ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ φρονοῦντος, εἰ τοῦ παθητικοῦ μὴ συνεφάπτοιτο μηδὲ συμπαραλαμβάνοι τὸ ἄλογον.

> Whenever the faculty of thought is active, not with passion but by itself, the body is in a state of calm and stands still, provided that it [the body] does not take hold of the passionate faculty nor bring in the non-rational part, since it [the body] does not itself share in nor participate in the activity of the thinking part. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451B1–5)

The rational part does not affect the body unless passion is involved, because it cannot.[15] Without passions, we cannot initiate action in our embodied state. The point is not explicit here in [T50], but if we turn back to a passage shortly before this, which follows directly from [T46], Plutarch argues that the passionate part of the soul is instrumental and necessary for the production of action:

[T51] ἡ δ' ἀναγκαία διὰ τὸ σῶμα καὶ δεομένη τῆς παθητικῆς ὥσπερ ὀργανικῆς ὑπηρεσίας ἐπὶ τὸ πρακτικόν, οὐκ οὖσα φθορὰ τοῦ ἀλόγου τῆς ψυχῆς οὐδ' ἀναίρεσις ἀλλὰ τάξις καὶ διακόσμησις.

> But the other kind of virtue [moral virtue], which is necessary because of the body and is in need of the service of the passionate instrument of the soul for practical action, is not the destruction of the non-rational part of the soul nor its removal but is the arrangement and ordering of the non-rational part. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444D4–7)

Passions serve as instruments for practical action (ὥσπερ ὀργανικῆς ὑπηρεσίας ἐπὶ τὸ πρακτικόν), so much so that the perfection of our passionate nature, moral virtue, is *necessary* because of the body and its concerns (ἀναγκαία διὰ τὸ σῶμα). Passions, then, are instrumental and *necessary* for practical action (ἐπὶ τὸ πρακτικόν), since reason alone, even the reason that

[14] Plutarch, *On the Sign of Socrates* 591D5–7=[T31] in Chapter 2; *On the Face in the Moon* 943A6–7.
[15] Cf. Plutarch, *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1024A8–10.

ranges over contingent affairs and deliberates about courses of action, cannot initiate actions without passions.[16]

This follows from Plutarch's conception of impulses and the role that Plutarch assigns to practical reason in the production of action. As Plutarch argues in *Whether the Affections of the Soul are Worse Than Those of the Body*, impulse (ὁρμή) is the source (ἀρχή) of practical action (πρᾶξις), and passions (τὰ πάθη) are impulses (501C12–D1).[17] Elsewhere, Plutarch writes that no passion is lacking in an impulse that leads to action (δραστηρίου ὁρμῆς οὐδὲν ἀπεστέρηται, *On Superstition* 165C8–11). The task of practical reason is, in addition to determining the correct ends and means of action, to bring our passions into moderate states so that they produce moderate and appropriate impulses to action, which are neither too vehement nor too weak. Continuing from [T49], I repeat a quotation from the previous chapter:

[T38] τὴν δ' ὁρμὴν τῷ πάθει ποιεῖ τὸ ἦθος, λόγου δεομένην ὁρίζοντος, ὅπως μετρία παρῇ καὶ μήθ' ὑπερβάλλῃ μήτ' ἐγκαταλείπῃ τὸν καιρόν.

> Moral virtue produces impulse with passion. This impulse needs reason to give it boundaries so that the impulse may be present to the right degree, not going to excess nor failing in deficiency for the critical moment. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444B1–4)

The rational part of the soul harnesses and makes use of passions to produce action, shaping passions and their impulses, making each one present to the right degree (μετρία) to produce

[16] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 10.8, 1178a14–16: "Some [moral actions] seem to happen due to the body, and moral virtue seems to be closely tied to the passions in many ways" (ἔνια δὲ καὶ συμβαίνειν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος δοκεῖ, καὶ πολλὰ συνῳκειῶσθαι τοῖς πάθεσιν ἡ τοῦ ἤθους ἀρετή). Cf. also 1178a19–20. Aristotle does not hold the view that action without passion is impossible, but he does hold that theoretical intellect does not initiate action. See n. 22 below.

[17] "For impulse is the source of practical action, and passions are the vehemence of impulse" (αἱ γὰρ ὁρμαὶ τῶν πράξεων ἀρχαί, τὰ δὲ πάθη σφοδρότητες ὁρμῶν). In the context of the passage, Plutarch discusses excessive *diseased* states of the passions (νοσῶν…ἐν τοῖς ψυχικοῖς πάθεσιν, 501C5–D6), but I take the notion of passionate involvement in impulse to be generalizable to cases in which passion is moderate and leads to action, as is evidenced by the instances in which passionate impulses can be moderate (*On Moral Virtue* 444B1–4=[T38] in Chapter 2). Cf. also *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 548D6–7. On excessive passions as diseased states (νοσήματα) in Plutarch's works see §VI of Chapter 2.

appropriate actions.[18]

When our passions are too weak, practical reason (ὁ πρακτικὸς λόγος) must incite (ἐξεγείρειν) and rekindle (ἀναῤῥιπίζειν) the impulses of our passions (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444B10–C6).[19] Yet even here, reason is not creating impulses of its own. Reason does not bypass the non-rational passions and bring about action by itself, but instead must stoke the flames of our non-rational passions to produce an appropriate impulse.

Through his division of intellectual and moral virtues, Plutarch assigns an essential role to passions and the passionate part of the soul that we cannot do without if we are to engage in practical actions. The care for our bodies and their well-being requires the activity of the passions; we would be inert and doomed to inaction (ἀπραξία) without them.[20] The division between intellectual and moral virtues based on the types of objects they cognize may appear largely indebted to Aristotle, as I note above, but even here, Plutarch's apparent reliance on an Aristotelian division can be traced back to a Platonic tradition.[21] Where Plutarch distinguishes his own psychology is in assigning all impulses that lead to action to the passionate part of the soul. Unlike Aristotle, for whom there are rational desires that seem to fuse a rational activity with a desiderative state that leads to action,[22] Plutarch describes every instance of practical action as

---

[18] Cf. Beneker 2012, p. 11: "[R]eason constrains the passions but also relies on them to provide impulse (ὁρμή) to action." Cf. also Opsomer 2012, p. 316.

[19] =[T37] in Chapter 2. Cf. Plutarch, *Table-Talk* 663D7–E4 and *Advice on Keeping Well* 128F1–4 in n. 37 below.

[20] Plutarch's view that passions are necessary for action can be formulated as an ἀπραξία type of argument, though Plutarch does not himself present it this way: Without passions, we are incapable of practical action, i.e. we are in a state of being unable to act in practical affairs (ἀπραξία). It is impossible to live life without action (see Cicero, *Academica* 2.31, 2.99; D.L. 9.104). We, therefore, cannot live life without passions. For Plutarch's defense of Academic skepticism against an ἀπραξία argument see Plutarch, *Reply to Colotes* 1122A–D. For other accounts of the ἀπραξία argument leveled against Academics see Cicero, *Academica* 2.37–8, 2.61–2, 2.104; D.L. 9.107; S.E., *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 1.23–4, 1.26; *Against the Professors* 7.30. Cf. Kechagia 2011, pp. 308–10. For a discussion on the origins of the ἀπραξία argument against Academic skepticism see Vander Waerdt 1989, pp. 244–7.

[21] Cf. *Republic* 5, 477d. See also Gauthier and Jolif's commentary to the *Nicomachean Ethics*, vol. 2, pp. 440–1, and Babut 1969a, p. 149, n. 76.

[22] For Aristotle, desire (ὄρεξις) can be rational as well as non-rational, where βούλησις is sometimes a form of rational desire. See Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics* 2.10, 1226b2–5, 1227a3–5: προαίρεσις has its desiderative component (βούλησις), which is "a desire belonging to reason itself, and not to any non-rational desire." See also

the product of a partnership between the rational part of the soul and the non-rational passionate parts.[23] Passions in Plutarch's view are a *sine qua non* for action, and the passionate parts of the soul must be present to contribute their part to action.

Plutarch thus presents different normative goals for the two classes of virtue: the intellectual virtues are to be free of passions, having ἀπάθεια as the goal in that domain,[24] but the moral virtues necessarily involve an appropriate measure of passion (μετριοπάθεια), the arrangement and ordering of the non-rational part of the soul (τάξις καὶ διακόσμησις) for the necessities of our bodies and for the sake of practical action (ἐπὶ τὸ πρακτικόν, *On Moral Virtue* 444D4–7=[T51]).[25] Both the intellectual and moral virtues require the rational part of the soul, but only moral virtue requires the passionate part for the sake of practical action.[26]

On the Soul 3.9, 432b5. Yet βούλησις can also be a form of non-rational desire (*Politics* 7.15, 1334b6–28) and desires and impulses belong to both our rational and non-rational aspects (*On the Soul* 3.9, 432b6–7). Cf. Fortenbaugh 2006, pp. 55–60; Sherman 1989, p. 170. See also Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 6.2, 1139a31–1139b5: προαίρεσις is the starting-point and source for action (πράξεως ἀρχή) and requires both intellect and character to perform good action (εὐπραξία), since intellect does not initiate motion by itself. Good action is something at which desire (ὄρεξις) aims. Therefore, προαίρεσις is desiderative intellect or intellectual desire (διὸ ἢ ὀρεκτικὸς νοῦς ἡ προαίρεσις ἢ ὄρεξις διανοητική). Cf. Kraut 2012, p. 533: "[T]hought that is undertaken for the sake of achieving some goal that is desired is the kind of thought that moves us. For Aristotle says, in the portion of VI 2 that leads to this statement, that it is desire and thought working and fused together that leads to action."

[23] Cf. Opsomer 2012, p. 325 and n. 76. That reason itself is inert is often taken to be a view put forward by David Hume. See Hume 2000, 3.1.1.3–15, esp. 3.1.1.5–12 and 2.3.3.1ff. In 3.1.1.5, Hume argues that reason concerns the truth and falsity of claims but is practically inert and inactive: "An active principle can never be founded on an inactive; and if reason be inactive in itself, it must remain so in all its shapes and appearances, whether it exerts itself in natural or moral subjects, whether it considers the powers of external bodies, or the actions of rational beings.… [R]eason is perfectly inert, and can never either prevent or produce any action or affection" (3.1.1.7–8). Cf. Sayre-McCord 2008: While Hume has often been taken to assign inactivity to all rational faculties, "The (Now) Standard Reading of Hume" as Sayre-McCord 2008 puts it (pp. 301–2), that reading does not do justice to Hume's actual arguments (pp. 302–11): "There is a common mistake in interpreting Hume's position that consists in thinking that Hume assumes—or is in some way committed to thinking—that reason alone cannot cause action, period. This is a more sweeping claim than he accepts and than his argument requires (though he does sometimes write as if he accepts this sweeping claim)" (p. 304). See also Singpurwalla 2010, p. 880: "Many philosophers today approach important psychological phenomena, such as weakness of the will and moral motivation, using a broadly Humean distinction between beliefs, which aim to represent the world, and desires, which aim to change the world. On this picture, desires provide the ends or goals of action, while beliefs simply tell us how to achieve those ends."

[24] See *On Moral Virtue* 444C10–D3=[T46] and *On the Sign of Socrates* 588D9–10.

[25] Cf. Babut 1969b, pp. 321–33; Gill 2006, pp. 237–8; Karamanolis 2013, p. 228. Cf. also Dillon 1977 and Roskam 2005, pp. 312–20. See also §V.d of the Introduction.

[26] I will discuss how Plutarch envisions the intellectual and moral virtues as related to each other and as parts of the moral life in Chapter 6, §IV.

This view bears a resemblance to the presentation of passions as the source of action and motivation in Plato's *Phaedrus*, which Plutarch exploits throughout *Platonic Questions* 9 (1008A1–5, C5–D6; 1009B2–8).[27] The Palinode section of the *Phaedrus* presents the image of a pre-incarnate soul in which the non-rational passionate parts are likened to a yoked pair of horses that pull a charioteer, who represents the rational part of the soul. The charioteer guides while the horses provide pulling-power (*Phaedrus* 247c3–248a6). In this picture, movement appears to be initiated by passions and correct action results when these motions are coordinated with reason.

Plato's *Republic*, however, may present a different picture in which passions are not needed for action. In the *Republic*, reason by itself appears to be capable of initiating practical actions without involving passions or the passionate parts of the soul.[28] The rational part of the soul in the *Republic* governs the non-rational parts and orients their desires to correct ends in the right way (*Republic* 4, 441e3–5, 442c4–7; 9, 586d4–587a2).[29] Beyond countermanding particular desires in cases of critical psychic conflict,[30] the rational part of the soul also appears to be capable of providing reasons for action apart from the non-rational desires themselves, since (i) it is capable of evaluating what objects and courses of action are worthwhile from rational principles, and (ii) those reasons for action are practically motivating.[31] While the non-rational

---

[27] I take up these points further in Chapter 4.

[28] I follow Cooper 1999b in the argument for practical rationality that follows.

[29] *Republic* 4, 441e3–5: "Therefore is it fitting for the rational part to rule, since it is wise and has foresight on behalf of the whole soul" (οὐκοῦν τῷ μὲν λογιστικῷ ἄρχειν προσήκει, σοφῷ ὄντι καὶ ἔχοντι τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁπάσης τῆς ψυχῆς προμήθειαν); 442c4–7: One is "wise by that small part which rules and gives commands to these [non-rational parts], since it in fact has, once again, knowledge within itself of what is beneficial to each part of the soul and to the whole that is common to the three parts of the soul" (σοφὸν δέ γε ἐκείνῳ τῷ σμικρῷ μέρει, τῷ ὃ ἦρχέν τ' ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ταῦτα παρήγγελλεν, ἔχον αὖ κἀκεῖνο ἐπιστήμην ἐν αὑτῷ τὴν τοῦ συμφέροντος ἑκάστῳ τε καὶ ὅλῳ τῷ κοινῷ σφῶν αὐτῶν τριῶν ὄντων). See also Watson 1975, esp. p. 212; Irwin 1977; and Nussbaum 1986, p. 138.

[30] Cf. *Republic* 4, 439a1–d8, for the example of the rational part effectively countering the appetitive part of the soul's desire for a drink and halting this desire from issuing in action.

[31] See Cooper 1999b, pp. 122–6 and 124–5, n. 9; 1999c, p. 240. Cooper also argues that this sense of practical motivation is presupposed in Plato's *Meno* and *Protagoras*. Cf. Teloh 1976, p. 346. Cf. also Cooper 1999b, p. 119, n. 2, where he argues that Aristotle also has a similar notion of practical rationality expressed in *Eudemian Ethics* 2.10, 1226b2–5, 1227a3–5. See n. 15 above.

passions, especially the appetitive part of the soul, are concerned with meeting the needs of bodily existence, the rational part of the soul is (i) capable of determining what is most fitting for each of the needs of the body, and, furthermore, is *better* at determining what is appropriate than the general desires of the appetitive part.[32] The rational part can, then, (i) determine what is needed and (ii) motivate actions without recourse to desires arising from other parts of the soul and do so in a way that is better determined than if one were to follow the influence of the non-rational passions.[33]

So, perhaps Plato's dialogues are not clear on whether passions are necessary for the production of practical action. Nevertheless, for Plutarch, passions issue from the passionate parts of the soul and these parts remain distinct from reason, just as the horses remain distinct from the charioteer in the *Phaedrus*, and, unlike what may be the position in the *Republic*, they are necessary for practical action. Reason by itself is inert (*On Moral Virtue* 451B1–5=[T50]).

§II Passions as the Wind in Our Sails

Beyond assigning a necessary role to passions in action, Plutarch claims that passions do much more. As we will explore in this section and those that follow, passions can also contribute

[32] See especially the remarks on the generic quality of appetitive desires in *Republic* 4, 437d1–438a5, where the desire is not for good drink, or any particular drink, but just drink, and also 9, 586d4–587a2, where Socrates explains that non-rational desires are best and most truly fulfilled when the rational part of the soul determines their objects and appropriate measures: "Could we confidently say that out of all the desires that concern both the profit-loving part [of the soul] and the victory-loving part [of the soul], those that follow knowledge and reason and with knowledge and reason pursue and take hold of the pleasures that the thinking part of the soul prescribes, these desires will take to themselves the most true pleasures, as far as it is possible for them to take true pleasures, since they follow truth, that is, pleasures that are their own, if what is best for each part is in fact most its own?" (θαῤῥοῦντες λέγωμεν ὅτι καὶ περὶ τὸ φιλοκερδὲς καὶ τὸ φιλόνικον ὅσαι ἐπιθυμίαι εἰσίν, αἳ μὲν ἂν τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ λόγῳ ἑπόμεναι καὶ μετὰ τούτων τὰς ἡδονὰς διώκουσαι, ἃς ἂν τὸ φρόνιμον ἐξηγῆται, λαμβάνωσι, τὰς ἀληθεστάτας τε λήψονται, ὡς οἷόν τε αὐταῖς ἀληθεῖς λαβεῖν, ἅτε ἀληθείᾳ ἑπομένων, καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν οἰκείας, εἴπερ τὸ βέλτιστον ἑκάστῳ, τοῦτο καὶ οἰκειότατον;) Cf. Plutarch, *On the Sign of Socrates* 584D–E.

[33] See also Kamtekar 2010, p. 134, who argues that the non-rational parts of the soul could be said to contribute only insofar as they free the rational part of the soul to do what is peculiar to itself, namely contemplate. The rational part of the soul, however, would still do a better job of meeting the needs of the body.

by enhancing and intensifying virtuous action and inciting a greater enthusiasm and desire to become virtuous. They make life *better*.

First, we will begin with Plutarch's depiction of passions as the "Wind in Our Sails" that help move the ship of soul. As in the Myth of the Charioteer of Plato's *Phaedrus*, passions provide motive force that can be harnessed and guided to good ends, but motive force is not a positive attribute *per se*; we can be propelled into error and blown off course by excessive passions.[34] Nevertheless, Plutarch writes that most people *need* passions to get moving at all:

[T52] τῶν δὲ παθῶν παντάπασιν ἀναιρεθέντων, εἰ καὶ δυνατόν ἐστιν, ἐν πολλοῖς ἀργότερος ὁ λόγος καὶ ἀμβλύτερος, ὥσπερ κυβερνήτης πνεύματος ἐπιλείποντος.

> But even if[35] it were possible for the passions to be entirely removed, in many people reason is too indolent and too blunted,[36] like a pilot when the wind fails to blow.
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 452B1–4)[37]

---

[34] Cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 247b1–c2: *If* the passions are harnessed correctly, they can add motivational force, but often the passions have the opposite effect, causing distraction and befuddling the rational part of the soul's ability to correctly steer the soul through life, as seen in the chaos experienced by charioteers who fail to gain the upper hand over their passions. Cf. Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444B1–10, the cables that keep us from inordinate and shameful actions can be broken by the powerful gust of passions (εἶθ' ὥσπερ ὑπὸ πνεύματος πολλοῦ ῥηγνυμένας τοῦ πάθους), leaving one to be swept along with full sails (πλησίστιος) toward pleasures, or cause one to shipwreck on the shameful shoals (περιπίπτει περὶ τὸ αἰσχρόν); *Whether the Affections of the Soul are Worse Than Those of the Body* 501D–E: Plutarch describes the stormy conditions of soul that disturb reason (λογισμός), which results in the lack of a pilot (ἀκυβέρνητος), as the soul is tossed about to shipwreck. Cf. also *To an Uneducated Ruler* 782D–E; *Timoleon* 6.1–5; *On the Control of Anger* 460A10–B10.

[35] For the rendering of εἰ καί as "even if," see the parallels in Smyth §2378: "εἰ (ἐὰν) καί not infrequently means *even if* in prose as well as poetry." Examples cited include passages from Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Isocrates. For a parallel in Plato's *Republic* see 551c2–4: "For consider the case if someone should thus choose captains based on wealth and would not hand the position over to a poor man, even if he should be more of a captain" (ἄθρει γάρ, εἰ νεῶν οὕτω τις ποιοῖτο κυβερνήτας, ἀπὸ τιμημάτων, τῷ δὲ πένητι, εἰ καὶ κυβερνητικώτερος εἴη, μὴ ἐπιτρέποι). The counter-factual reading I have given here is also supported by the earlier passage at 443C2–5 in *On Moral Virtue*, which I turn to below. Cf. also Babut 1969a, p. 124, and Beneker 2012, p. 56–7, for a similar counterfactual reading here.

[36] For the translation of the comparative adjectives as denoting excess see Smyth §1083c.

[37] Cf. Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008A1–4: "Justly has nature given to the greatest part of the soul the place that is above, establishing in the head the rational part of the soul like a pilot" (καὶ δικαίως τῷ κρατίστῳ ἀποδέδωκε τὴν ἄνω χώραν ἡ φύσις, ὥσπερ κυβερνήτην ἐνιδρύσασα τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸν λογισμόν). Cf. also Plutarch, *Table-Talk* 663D7–E4: "As pilots withdraw from a violent wind, but no one is able to rekindle and stir it back up again after is has ceased and died down, in the same way it is no great fear to resist a desire and curtail its excess, but it altogether hard and difficult to intensify and rekindle it [desire] when it has been worn down before its season, is relaxed, and has lost what is proper to itself" (ὡς δὲ λάβρον πνεῦμα κυβερνῆται πολλαῖς μηχαναῖς ὑποφεύγουσιν, παυσάμενον δὲ καὶ μαρανθὲν οὐδεὶς πάλιν ἐκριπίσαι καὶ διασεῖσαι δυνατός ἐστιν, οὕτως πρὸς ὄρεξιν ἐνστῆναι μὲν καὶ κολοῦσαι τὸ πλεονάζον αὐτῆς οὐ μέγ' ἔργον, ἤδη δὲ κάμνουσαν πρὸ καιροῦ καὶ μαλθακιζομένην καὶ ἀπολείπουσαν τὸ οἰκεῖον ἐντεῖναι καὶ ἀναζωπυρῆσαι παγχάλεπον, ὦ ἑταῖρε, καὶ δύσεργον); *Advice on Keeping Well* 128F1–4: "One ought to treat the body like a sail and not draw it in and press it

In this image, reason stands at the helm, like a pilot guiding and steering the ship, while the passions initiate movement and provide continued propulsion to act.[38] In this image, Plutarch affirms the notion adumbrated in the *Phaedrus*'s Myth of the Charioteer: guidance is the pilot's bailiwick, not the jolt that sets the vehicle in motion nor the force that keeps it going.

Yet in this passage, Plutarch seems to entertain an option which in the last section we saw him deny. In the Wind in Our Sails passage, it looks as though the *majority* of people (οἱ πολλοί) need passions to provide motivation, but a *few* individuals might still be able to act through reason alone, without any involvement of the passions. If this is Plutarch's position, then it contradicts his arguments on why passions are necessary for practical action, which we surveyed in §I. Long before we get to the metaphor of passions as the wind in our sails, Plutarch also denies the possibility that we can be entirely rid of passions in this life. Non-rational passions are inextricable from the incarnate life: "To remove non-rational passion completely" (τὸ πάθος ἐξαιρεῖν παντάπασιν), he writes, "is not possible" (οὔτε δυνατόν, *On Moral Virtue* 443C9).[39] If passions can be entirely removed, then Plutarch would have to reverse his position on this point as well.

Though Plutarch appears to concede that one might, after all, be able to act without passions, he is not actually stepping back from the claims we saw him making in the previous section. Passions and the non-rational passionate parts of the soul are indeed necessary for practical action. Instead, Plutarch presents a dialectical argument for his opponents, the Stoics,

---

in hard when the weather is fair nor use it in a careless and negligent manner when he is in a state of suspicion [that something may be wrong]" (δεῖ δ' ὥσπερ ἱστίον τὸ σῶμα μήτε συστέλλειν εὐδίας οὔσης καὶ πιέζειν σφόδρα, μήτ' ἀνειμένως χρῆσθαί τε καὶ καταφρονεῖν ἐν ὑποψίᾳ γενόμενον). Cf. Babut 1969b, p. 329, n. 3.

[38] On the frequent use of wind as a metaphor for passions see Nussbaum 1994, ch. 12, and Lutz 1988. See also n. 34 above.

[39] Cf. also *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1025D, discussed below.

whose position he addresses in 452C6–D1, shortly after the Wind in Our Sails passage. The Stoics deny the usefulness of passions in motivating action, since they believe that all passions are excessive impulses.[40] In the Wind in Our Sails passage, Plutarch presents a hypothetical scenario in which it might be possible for action to be initiated without passions, as the Stoics believe to be the case for rational impulses (λογικαὶ ὁρμαί).[41] *Even if* that were possible, Plutarch argues in the Wind in Our Sails passage, the Stoics must admit that most people would be *too weak* and indolent in their capacities to do anything worthwhile and perhaps anything at all without passions.[42] The rational part of the soul would not pull out the oars, as it were, when the sea and air are placid, to begin a second-sailing (δεύτερος πλοῦς).[43] Most people would simply fail to move or do anything useful. The Stoics should take this point into consideration in their view that passions provide excessive impulses, Plutarch argues, since it seems entirely plausible to think that most people would be *deficient* in their impulses and motivations without passions. The problem of motivation and impulse, then, lies not only in excessive impulses of passions, but also in a lack of motivational drive in the absence of passions.

In the argument against the Stoics that follows (452C6–D1), Plutarch pushes the point further and accuses the Stoics of self-delusion or outright hypocrisy on this point. The Stoics, just as much as anyone else, Plutarch argues, recognize the usefulness of passions in motivating

---

[40] Stob. 2.7.10=*SVF* 3.378=LS 65A; Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 441C10–D3 and 449C3–7.
[41] Stob. 2.7.9 (p. 86, l. 17–p. 87, l. 6)=*SVF* 3.169=LS 53Q.
[42] They are too indolent (ἀργότεροι), that is, lazy and inefficacious (ἀεργός / ἀργός), to motivate action. For the sense of inefficacy see Plato, *Euthydemus* 272a6: the battle is unaccomplished (μάχη ἀργός). They also seem to lack proper vision to see what is required, since being too blunted (ἀμβλύτερος) contrasts with having sharp vision and foresight, which would be excellent qualities characteristic of the good captain of a ship and of the rational part of the soul in a virtuous soul (cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 442c4–7; 9, 586d4–587a2). On the contrast between being blunt and being sharp, note that nine out of ten of the uses of ἀμβλύς in Plato's dialogues, the term is contrasted with "sharp" (ὀξύς) in terms of visual or auditory acuity: *Theaetetus* 174e7, *Sophist* 232e8, *Parmenides* 165c1, *Euthydemus* 281d1, *Republic* 10, 596a, *Laws* 4, 715d8; as a general antithesis: *Lysis* 215e7; or in terms of angles of a triangle, obtuse vs. acute: *Timaeus* 55a1
[43] Cf. *Phaedo* 99c–d. I mean by this allusion nothing more than to draw out the sense of a second-best alternative, failing the first option.

action and instilling a desire to become virtuous, since they also use these emotions to motivate action and encourage a desire for virtue in others. Implicitly, they must already agree that most people are somehow deficient in their impulses toward virtue without these passions, otherwise they would not themselves be using them.[44] Their actions belie their own avowed assertions. And so, Plutarch argues, *even if* it were possible to motivate action without passions, passions would still be useful, since most people need passions to motivate them to act and to become virtuous.

§III Enhancing Action and Divine Aid

Immediately following the Wind in Our Sails passage, Plutarch launches into examples in which passions *enhance* action, such as passionate inspiration, god-breathed battle-fury, and courage (452B4–C4). Drawing on passages from Homer's *Iliad*, Plutarch writes that the passionate and inspired element of the soul (τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιῶδες)[45] can render one impossible to resist and unconquerable, just as the gods breathed great might into Agamemnon (ἔμπνευσε μένος μέγα, Homer, *Iliad* 15.262) and empowered Diomedes' battle-rage (μαίνεται, Homer, *Iliad* 5.185).[46] In the *aristeia* passages from Homer, the gods bestow a kind of battle-fury and ensure success through special intervention into human affairs. In the context of these passages, other heroes quickly recognize the role of divine aid and realize that the fight is not equal-handed in such periods of divine succor; they must await the end of divine favor bestowed upon their enemy before they have a chance to defeat them. God-breathed battle-rage bestows a

[44] I will take up this argument further in Chapter 5, §IV, where I discuss Plutarch's arguments on the role of shame in moral progress, but here I give the argument in brief in order to contextualize Plutarch's Wind in Our Sails passage.
[45] While the majority of manuscripts have τὸ before ἐνθουσιῶδες, I read τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιῶδες as a hendiadys, "the passionate, enthusiastic part," which indicates a single part of the soul. As a parallel see Plutarch's use of hendiadys with "the passionate, non-rational part" (τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἄλογον) nn. 65–6 in Chapter 2. As should become clear below, Plutarch indicates that the capacity or part by which we experience inspiration is the non-rational passionate part of the soul.
[46] Quoted in Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 452C3 and C4 respectively.

mantle of increased power and success, an enhancement of activity through passionate empowerment.

Passions here provide more than a low or adequate impulse to action; they give a forceful boost. Passions can be experienced as inspiration and enthusiasm (ἐνθουσιασμός), true to their etymologies, as though a god or aiding spirit is within (ἐν-θεός). Plutarch continues by writing that Homer describes the gods (οἱ θεοί, 452C1) as inspiring heroes in *Iliad* 15.262 and 5.185:

[T53] καθάπερ ὅρμημα τῷ λογισμῷ καὶ ὄχημα τὸ πάθος προστιθέντας.

> just as though they [the gods] have added passion as a driving-force and vehicle to reason. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 452C5–6)

Here, Plutarch does not keep the notion restricted to rage or might (μένος) through courage, but instead leads with a general description of "passion" (τὸ πάθος), which leaves open the possibility that *all* or any number of *kinds of passion* have been added to reason by the gods, whether passions of the spirited part or appetitive part of the soul. This is our first hint that Plutarch intends for us to understand more in [T53] than is implied in the narrowed description of enhanced battle-rage given in the Homeric examples above (452C3–4). In a passage from the *Dialogue on Love*, Plutarch includes passion in friendship as aided by god: one is, "as it were, borne along on a wave of passion with god's help into friendship" (καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν φιλίαν…καθάπερ ἐπὶ κύματος τοῦ πάθους ἅμα θεῷ φερομένη, 759D3–4). From these passages, we see that passions, not limited just to battle-rage, exhibit a touch of the divine.

Moreover, in addition to including more than just a single class of non-rational passions, such as those belonging exclusively to the spirited part of the soul or limited to instances of rage and fury, Plutarch additionally is not limiting his discussion of passionate enhancement to one-off experiences of passions in [T53]. Even though [T53] follows two examples of temporary

inspiration,[47] it alludes to passages in both the *Phaedrus* and the *Timaeus*, which, as we will see, make clear that Plutarch has in mind a description of the structure of the soul in [T53], not merely particular instances of passionate enhancement. The gods have given the passionate parts to the human soul as a gift for self-motivated action in addition to providing particular moments of inspiration.

First, in describing passions as the vehicle (ὄχημα) and incitement (ὅρμημα) to reason, we are brought back to the charioteer image in which the rational part of the soul is joined to the horse-power of the non-rational parts in chariots (ὀχήματα, *Phaedrus* 247b2).[48] In that image, the non-rational passions are not so much the vehicle itself as much as they are the impetus and pulling force of the vehicle; the passions are more of a consistent driving force (ὅρμημα).[49] But,

[47] Cf. Frazier 2008, p. 126: Frazier sees the momentary inspiration of passion as an instance of μανία drawn from Plato's *Phaedrus*, contrasting battle-fury inspiration, which ceases at the end of one's *aristeia*, with the persistence of the nagging passion of ἔρως, which does not cease after a quick bout of expression and cathartic release. I take Plutarch's discussion here to connect more with the passage we see in Plato's *Timaeus* (discussed below), as indicating sources of passion within the soul, not just instances of inspiration that may have different durations.

[48] Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 41d8–e2 and Philo, *On the Cheribum* 24: The Demiurge assigns souls to board stars as vehicles that they drive round the heavens; Cf. also Pseudo-Plato, *Epinomis* 986a8–b8. For discussion of the developing notion of the ethereal body, the ὄχημα-πνεῦμα, or the increasingly physically entangled vehicle of soul in Neoplatonism and early Christianity of Late Antiquity, see Finamore 1985; Sorabji 2005, pp. 221–41; and Dillon 2013. For a very different take on the vehicle of soul in a late Christian author cf. Gregory of Nyssa *On Virginity* 12, who describes the Holy Spirit as the vehicle of the soul.

[49] The only usage of ὅρμημα in Plutarch's extant corpus occurs in [T53]. In addition to being a bit of paronomasia with ὄχημα, it also brings to mind its near homophone, ἅρμα, the war-chariot. More than this, Plutarch might also have in mind the first extant usages of ὅρμημα in Homer's *Iliad*, given his familiarity with Homer as attested by his many quotations. In passages from the second book of the *Iliad*, heroes of the Greek and allied forces who are set on sacking Troy seek "to avenge the longings and groans for Helen" (τίσασθαι δ' Ἑλένης ὁρμήματά τε στοναχάς τε, 2.356, repeated in 2.590). Some interpreters have taken the longings and groans as issuing from Helen herself, making Ἑλένης the genitive possessor or source rather than the genitive object of ὁρμήματα and στοναχάς. Since the Greek army and its allies are set on punishing Troy, more specifically Paris and his father Priam, for the rapine of Helen and her subsequent detention within the Trojan walls, it makes little sense to think of "the longings and groans" as issuing forth from Helen as their subject. That would imply that the Greeks desire to avenge *Helen*'s misconduct, not *Paris*'. I follow Aristarchus' interpretation in seeing Helen as the object of longings and groans (see H. Erbse ed. (1969), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (*scholia vetera*), 2.356a–356b). Aristarchus connects the ὁρμήματα of this line with the worries or cares (μεριμνήματα) attendant upon Helen's capture. See the LSJ entry of ὅρμημα for a brief discussion of its history and etymology from ὁρμαίνω, "to long for," supported by Aristarchus in this passage. Whether the Greek army is intent on avenging Paris for his inappropriate longings for Helen or to avenge the suffering of Menelaus' longings for his absent wife, this first extant use of the term signifies a deep-seated passionate longing. It is not a mere stimulus, but an enduring passion strong enough to set disaster rolling for an entire generation of Greeks, Trojans, and their allies.

that image is not one of a temporary experience of passion, such as a burst of anger, a fleeting moment of euphoria, or a momentary exhilaration in battle, as we might have expected following upon the Homeric examples before [T53]. Passions are a more enduring feature of the human psyche, since the non-rational parts of the soul, like the horses in the Myth of the Charioteer, are distinct elements that are sources of motivation.

The other passage to which Plutarch appears to allude confirms that we are on the right track. Plato's *Timaeus* similarly describes the non-rational passions as additions to the rational part of human souls. In the "likely account" (ὁ εἰκὼς μυθός)[50] of creation in that dialogue, the lesser gods fashion the human soul by adding passions to its rational nature:

[T29] οἱ δὲ μιμούμενοι, παραλαβόντες ἀρχὴν ψυχῆς ἀθάνατον, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο θνητὸν σῶμα αὐτῇ περιετόρνευσαν ὄχημά τε πᾶν τὸ σῶμα ἔδοσαν ἄλλο τε εἶδος ἐν αὐτῷ ψυχῆς προσῳκοδόμουν τὸ θνητόν, δεινὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα ἐν ἑαυτῷ παθήματα ἔχον.

> And imitating [the Demiurge], they took the immortal principle of the soul and thereupon spread around it a mortal body and provided the entire body as a *vehicle*. They also framed a different mortal form of soul inside it, having dreadful and necessary *passions* within it. (Plato, *Timaeus* 69c5–d1)

Compare [T53] now with this passage, which is [T29] in Chapter 2. In both instances, the gods add passions (τὸ πάθος / τὰ παθήματα) to the rational part of the soul, described as reason (λογισμός) in [T53], and the divine, immortal principle of the soul (ἀρχὴ ψυχῆς ἀθάνατος) in [T29]. Plutarch's mention of the gods' addition of a vehicle (ὄχημα) also draws close to the description in the *Timaeus*. Plutarch departs from this passage in the *Timaeus*, however, by putting emphasis not on the physical vessel (ὄχημα) of the body, but instead on the passions that accompany the creation of the body.[51] With this passage from the *Timaeus* in the background, we

[50] *Timaeus* 29d2, 59c6, 68d2, and 72d7.

[51] Cf. *On Moral Virtue* 450F6–7: Plutarch seems to indicate that the passionate element is closely tied to the body and decreases in strength together with the body (τοῦ παθητικοῦ τῷ σώματι συναπομαραινομένου) as one ages. In the *Republic* (328D) Cephalus describes certain passions as decreasing due to senescence. The same notion is present in Plato's *Laws* (1, 645d1–e3; 2, 671b8–c2), where the decline in good emotions can be countered through

see that [T53] describes psychic composition, not merely instances or movements of passion in the soul.

Plutarch also puts a more positive interpretation on the addition than we find in [T53]. While the vehicular notion in the *Timaeus* provides the sense of physical locomotion, such that the soul moves together with the body that it inhabits, Plutarch's vehicle of the soul focuses on the motivational force of the passions. The implication from [T53] is that gods have added non-rational passion in order to *aid* humans, namely as a driving force and vehicle. They are not merely necessary, dreadful additions (*Timaeus* 69c8–d1). The gods have granted passions to humans to aid the intellectual part of their souls.

Given this addition to the soul, the wind in our sails need not always come from outside ourselves, as though we depend invariably on external sources of motivation, like the captain of a ship who must wait on a favorable breeze. The gods inspire our actions not only by providing an extra boost on occasion, as though blowing a gust of air into the sails, but also by giving us internal sources of motivation to act. Like the Aeolian bag of wind given to Odysseus (*Odyssey* 10.19–24), the gods have given us our own source of wind, as it were, for self-propulsion.

§IV Attached Passions and Intensifying Virtue

Plutarch also indicates that particular passions can come to the aid of reason to push us on the right course and to intensify virtuous actions. As to the first, Plutarch argues that it is appropriate for certain passions, such as anger, to call us to action in particular situations. While passions may interfere with our deliberations and oppose our better judgment, as though passions are attached to one side of a balance-beam (ζυγόν) as we weigh out what we ought to do (*On*

alcoholic consumption, since many passions are reawakened and reinvigorated while one is inebriated. Cf. Belfiore 1986, who believes that the *Laws*' treatment of the passions through inebriation may have influenced Aristotle's theory of catharsis.

Moral Virtue 447D6–F4), sometimes, Plutarch writes, they help tip the scale in the right direction:

[T54] ὥσπερ ἐκεῖ μάχης καὶ διαφορᾶς τοῦ πάθους πρὸς τὸν λογισμὸν αἴσθησις ἔστιν, οὕτως ἐνταῦθα πειθοῦς καὶ ἀκολουθίας, οἷον ἐπιρρέποντος καὶ συνεπιδιδόντος.

> Just as in the one case [of growing angry unjustifiably against one's family members] there is a perception of fighting and conflict of passion against reasoning, likewise in the other case [of growing angry justifiably against enemies] there is a perception of obedience and conformity, that, as it were, tips the scale in its favor and increases the force of its decision. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 448D7–10)

In the second instance here, Plutarch imagines a situation in which one acts justly (δικαίως) on behalf of one's children and other family members. Instead of finding a passion attached to the balance beam on the opposite side from a better judgment, Plutarch here describes a case in which passions help one make the right decision and pursue the correct course of action. They weigh in favor of the right judgment, as though the weight of passion helps pull one headlong to the just action that reason determines to be the right course, without hesitation. Here, passion contributes to a just action (συνεπιδιδόντος, 448D10) and adds force to our rational judgment (ταῖς προστιθεμένου τοῦ πάθους κρίσεσι, 449C2–3). At the critical moment (τῷ καιρῷ), passion helps set us in motion.[52]

Anger is not always a good counselor nor should we heed its goads hastily in every situation. In *On the Control of Anger*, those who have a temper and tend to overreact in anger are advised to keep their deliberations dispassionate when considering how they will react to perceived slights and injustices (*On the Control of Anger* 460A5–10, 459C3–E4; *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550E2–F4).[53] If they were to reflect upon their past faults, they would realize that their reactions are often premature and overly zealous. While angry, their reasoning

[52] Cf. 444B1–4=[T38] in Chapter 2 and repeated above. See also *Table-Talk* 663D7–E4 in n. 37 above and *Beasts are Rational* 989B5–8, quoted in n. 115 of Chapter 2.
[53] Cf. also *On the Control of Anger* 459A8–B2.

is tossed about by the gale-storm winds of their anger. Like those who row their boats out into a storm, they are poised for disaster (*On the Control of Anger* 460A10–B10). While anger may help bring an injustice to their attention, they should wait and deliberate when in a calmed temperament, lest they act in a way that they will later come to regret or begin to develop an unhealthy desire to punish others and take pleasure in it (*On the Control of Anger* 460C1–7[54]; *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550F4–551A3[55]).

Yet in certain situations, perhaps even for those who are prone to excess, anger can be appropriate in its call to action. In *On the Control of Anger*, it is conceded that though we often give hatred of evil as a pretext for our angry reactions there still is an appropriate place for righteous anger (μισοπονηρία) in the moral life (463B7–C1, E1–6).[56] As we see in [T54], when our friends and family are in peril or are unjustly treated, our hatred of injustice and our desire to fight against it properly rouses us to action to the right end and in agreement with a correct judgment, helping us get straightway and forcefully to action.

In addition to inciting action, spirited passions such as anger can also intensify virtuous action. While beasts of burden are useful to humans for both agriculture and hunting, as the horse belongs under the yoke of the chariot, the ox is fit for the plow, and dogs serve to aid our hunt

[54] "We should avoid being carried off to pleasure and rejoicing in vengeance, as though from a desire to take enjoyment in punishing" (οὐ…πρὸς ἡδονὴν δεῖ καθάπερ ἀπολαύσματος ὀρέξει τῆς τιμωρίας ἐμφορεῖσθαι καὶ χαίρειν κολάζοντας).

[55] "For to encounter turbid water and use it because of a lack of self-control is less evil, as Socrates used to say, than for our reason, muddied with passion and brim-full of anger and rage to glut oneself with punishment of our kith and kin, the human race" (ὕδατι γὰρ τεταραγμένῳ προσπεσόντα χρῆσθαι δι' ἀκρασίαν ἧττόν ἐστι κακόν, ὡς Σωκράτης ἔλεγεν, ἢ θολερὸν ὄντα καὶ διάπλεω τὸν λογισμὸν ὀργῆς καὶ μανίας, πρὶν ἢ καταστῆναι καὶ γενέσθαι καθαρόν, ἐμφορεῖσθαι τιμωρίας συγγενοῦς καὶ ὁμοφύλου σώματος). Cf. LSJ s.v. ὁμόφυλος, which it taken to be wider in extension than ὁμοεθνής, "of the same people group / race," and to be more inclusive in describing an entire species.

[56] Cf. Ingenkamp 2000, pp. 263–4, and Van Hoof 2005, p. 502. Plutarch writes more explicitly in *On Envy and Hate* that "many people are hated justly, whom we call worthy-of-hate" (μισοῦνται δὲ πολλοὶ δικαίως, οὓς ἀξιομισήτους καλοῦμεν, 537C9–10) and "righteous anger is in the class of things we praise" (ἡ μισοπονηρία τῶν ἐπαινουμένων ἐστί, D3).

for boars (*On Moral Virtue* 451D6–8),[57] Plutarch writes that "the brood-like group of passions are *far more useful*" (πολὺ χρησιμώτερα τὰ τῶν παθῶν θρέμματα, 451D9),

[T55] τῷ λογισμῷ συμπαρόντα καὶ συνεντείνοντα ταῖς ἀρεταῖς, ὁ θυμὸς τῇ ἀνδρείᾳ, μέτριος ὤν, ἡ μισοπονηρία τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἡ νέμεσις ἐπὶ τοὺς παρ' ἀξίαν εὐτυχοῦντας, ὅταν ἅμ' ἀνοίᾳ καὶ ὕβρει φλεγόμενοι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπισχέσεως δέωνται.

> because they come to the *aid* of the rational part and they *intensify* virtues: anger, when it is moderate, [*aids* and *intensifies*] courage; righteous anger [*aids* and *intensifies*] justice; and indignation [*aids* and *intensifies*] one's opposition to those who fair well undeservedly whenever they burn with foolishness and insolence in their souls and need to be stopped. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451D9–E4)

In each of these instances, anger *adds* something to the execution of action, and not just any action, be it good or bad, but to *virtuous* actions. The first example of an anger (ὁ θυμός) that aids and intensifies courage also notes that this emotion is moderate (μέτριος ὤν). While we might expect that only excessive anger would give stronger force to courage, Plutarch emphasizes that the emotions that intensify and aid in virtuous action are correctly oriented and moderated.[58] These emotions provide an intensifying force to action without going to excess.

§V Incitement to Virtue, Enthusiasm, and Non-Rational Longing for Virtue

In addition to weighing in on our decision and intensifying the execution of virtuous actions, passions can also aid us in the pursuit of becoming virtuous. In his biographical work on the Spartan king Agesilaus, Plutarch writes that certain spirited emotions, such as the love of honor and of competition (τὸ φιλότιμον καὶ φιλόνεικον) and rivalry among citizens (ζῆλος) can serve as an *incentive* to virtue (ὑπέκκαυμα τῆς ἀρετῆς, *Agesilaus* 5.3–4[59]; *On Moral Virtue*

[57] Plutarch quotes Pindar (fr. 234 Maehler) in this passage.
[58] Cf. Wright 2008, p. 140: "Provided that reason molds and controls the passions, they can serve as powerful catalysts stimulating virtuous behavior. Furthermore, when held in moderation, the passions can assist reason by intensifying virtues."
[59] Plutarch first draws upon natural philosophers (οἱ φυσικοί) who believe that quarreling and strife (νεῖκος καὶ

452B4–6[60]). Like horses under the yoke of a chariot that run harder when paired together than when apart, so men because of rivalry with one another are more eager in their pursuit of a common good deed (*Pelopidas* 19.4).[61] These passions light a fire under someone (ὑπεκκαίειν), as it were, kindling the flames of their drive for self-worth and self-fulfillment.

These emotions need not even involve comparison and competition with others to be useful for moral progress. As in the case of Julius Caesar, one may enter into rivalry *with oneself* (ζῆλος αὐτοῦ) for the purposes of self-improvement, ever trying to outdo one's own past deeds (*Caesar* 58.4).[62] For Caesar, this rivalry with himself was not necessarily motivated by a desire for moral improvement so much as by a desire for greater glory, but Plutarch takes the notion in a decidedly moral direction, encouraging us to remind one another in times of error of our better selves and actions of the past so that we may imitate our projected better selves for the purposes of ethical improvement. The rebuke of another

[T56] ζῆλον ἐμποιεῖ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν αἰδουμένῳ τὰ αἰσχρὰ τῇ τῶν καλῶν ὑπομνήσει καὶ παράδειγμα ποιουμένῳ τῶν βελτιόνων ἑαυτόν.

> produces rivalry against oneself, because one feels shame over one's disgraceful deeds by the memory of [one's past] noble deeds, and one sets oneself as a model of better ones. (Plutarch, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 72D2–4).

ἔρις) are necessary for the universe to be put into motion. He compares this cosmic view with those, like the Spartan lawgiver (ὁ Λακωνικὸς νομοθέτης), who believe that the love of honor and competition must be present for people to pursue virtue (*Agis and Cleomenes* 5.3). Plutarch, however, has some reservation and writes that one should not accept these principles *simply* put, since in their excess they are harsh to the citizens and present great dangers (ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἂν οὕτως τις ἁπλῶς συγχωρήσειεν· αἱ γὰρ ὑπερβολαὶ τῶν φιλονεικιῶν χαλεπαὶ ταῖς πόλεσι καὶ μεγάλους κινδύνους ἔχουσι). He nevertheless does support the general idea that some rivalry can be good to spur people to an edifying competition in the pursuit of virtue. See Duff 1999, pp. 83–7, and 2008, p. 14, for further discussion of these examples from Plutarch's *Lives* and those that follow in this section.

[60] Plutarch seems to have the same lawgivers (οἱ νομοθέται), such as the Spartans, in mind as in *Agesilaus* 5.3–7 (see the previous note), who "implant into their citizens the love of honor and rivalry with one another" (ἐμβάλλουσιν εἰς τὰς πολιτείας φιλοτιμίαν καὶ ζῆλον πρὸς ἀλλήλους).

[61] On other positive aspects of the love of honor see also *Themistocles* 3.4–5 and *On Moral Progress* 84B–C, which relate that admiration (θαυμάζειν) and praise (ἐπαινεῖν) led Themistocles to imitate (μιμεῖσθαι) and emulate (ζηλοῦν) good examples, and *Theseus* 6.8–9, 25.5, which describes Theseus as driven to emulate great deeds to good ends by the example of Hercules.

[62] Caesar's "passion was nothing other than a rivalry with himself as though with another person, and [it was] a kind of competition for future actions compared to those already complete" (τὸ μὲν πάθος οὐδὲν ἦν ἕτερον ἢ ζῆλος αὐτοῦ καθάπερ ἄλλου καὶ φιλονικία τις ὑπὲρ τῶν μελλόντων πρὸς τὰ πεπραγμένα).

This form of rivalry avoids the dangers of competition with others that can rouse a love of strife that belongs to vice (τὸ φιλόνεικον τῆς κακίας, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 72D5–7). It aims purely at self-improvement, attempting to emulate the best parts of one's own actions and character, drawing on past memory to excite a desire to improve upon one's current state of soul.

To some extent, this positive aspect of the love of honor is anticipated in Plato's *Symposium*. If a true lover progresses correctly in his ascent on the ladder of love (211c2–d1), one rung, as it were, along the way concerns noble pursuits and endeavors (210c6–d7, 211c5–7). Those who are pregnant in soul will desire to give birth to virtue and wisdom and to leave behind enviable offspring in the form of poetry, laws, and in their own glorious reputations (208e1–209e4). In addition to being motivated by the erotic drive that pervades all of their endeavors,[63] from the pursuit of beautiful bodies to the desire for the Form of Beauty itself, they are driven at this stage by a desire for honor (φιλοτιμία, 208c3) and a feeling of rivalry (ζῆλος, 209d2). This rivalrous passion is channeled and put to good use. Instead of fighting over lovers or objects that distract from the upward course, these passions help lovers to continue to advance in an innocuous competition toward virtue, knowledge, and fulfillment.[64]

[63] See especially *Symposium* 210e5–6: "It was for the sake of this [Beauty itself] that one had all the preceding toils, Socrates" (τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο, ὦ Σώκρατες, οὗ δὴ ἕνεκεν καὶ οἱ ἔμπροσθεν πάντες πόνοι ἦσαν). See also *Republic* 6, 505e1–5: "That which every soul seeks and for the sake of which it does all things, divining that it is, but being at a loss and not able to grasp sufficiently what it is nor to make use a stable conviction as it does about other things, for which reason it fails to gain any benefit from the other things" (ὅ δὴ διώκει μὲν ἅπασα ψυχὴ καὶ τούτου ἕνεκα πάντα πράττει, ἀπομαντευομένη τι εἶναι, ἀποροῦσα δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσα λαβεῖν ἱκανῶς τί ποτ' ἐστὶν οὐδὲ πίστει χρήσασθαι μονίμῳ οἵᾳ καὶ περὶ τὰ ἄλλα, διὰ τοῦτο δὲ ἀποτυγχάνει καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἴ τι ὄφελος ἦν).

[64] Cf. Shiffman 2010, pp. 249–10. As Shiffman points out, Plutarch draws upon this passage in *Platonic Questions* 1, 999E, where he describes the perverse misdirection of this desire in sophists who aim at glory apart from moral improvement and honors divorced from a genuine desire for knowledge and truth.

In addition to these spirited emotions, Plutarch also draws upon the notion in the *Symposium* that erotic desires provide a natural *pull* toward virtue. Beauty's magnetic power of attraction in the *Symposium*, which draws us to itself as the ultimate object of our affections and desires (210e2–212c3) seems to lie in the background to Plutarch's description of powerful affective desires *toward* virtue (δεινοὶ ἔρωτες πρὸς τὴν ἀρετήν, *On Listening to Lectures* 47C5–6). In line with this, Plutarch also describes the stretching of desire toward virtue as a longing (πόθος) for philosophy and moral progress:

[T57] καθάπερ οὖν ἔρωτος ἀρχομένου σημεῖόν ἐστιν οὐ τὸ χαίρειν τῷ καλῷ παρόντι (τοῦτο γὰρ κοινόν) ἀλλὰ τὸ δάκνεσθαι καὶ ἀλγεῖν ἀποσπώμενον, οὕτως…. μέτριος μὲν ἄν σοι φανείη καὶ πρᾶος ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι καὶ συμφιλοσοφεῖν ὅταν δ' ἀποσπασθῇ καὶ χωρὶς γένηται, θεῶ φλεγόμενον καὶ ἀδημονοῦντα καὶ δυσκολαίνοντα πᾶσι πράγμασι καὶ ἀσχολίαις, μνήμην δὲ φιλῶν ὥσπερ ἄλογος ἐλαύνεται πόθῳ τῷ πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν.

> Just as the sign of a love that is beginning is not found in rejoicing in one's beautiful [beloved] when he is present (since that is normal), but in feeling gnawing bites of pain and distress when separated [from him], similarly…someone would seem to you moderate and gentle while present and taking part in philosophical discourse, but whenever he is separated and is apart from it, observe him burning, in anguish, and annoyed with all matters and engagements, cherishing the memory of it, like a non-rational animal driven by a longing for philosophy.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Progress* 77B5–C6)

Interestingly, Plutarch notes that it is in a *non-rational* state (ἄλογος) that one feels this internal urging to pursue philosophical advancement, perhaps similar to the longing and urging attributed to non-rational animals in the *Symposium* (207a8–9).[65] The itch for philosophy is not just a rational curiosity or a certain cold calculation in pursuit of the appropriate end of life.[66] It is a

[65] While the point is not made explicit in the *Symposium*, there seems to be a connection between the desire for reproduction that all wild, non-rational beasts feel (τοῦ ἔρωτος καὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας…ὡς δεινῶς διατίθεται πάντα τὰ θηρία ἐπειδὰν γεννᾶν ἐπιθυμήσῃ, 207a8–9) and the longing for beauty and virtue that those who are truly pregnant have for engaging in discourse (208e1–209e4).

[66] Cf. *Republic* 9, 580d6–e3, 581b6–11; *Phaedo* 65c9, 66b6–7; 67b4, 67d7–68c2. Cf. also *Philebus* 51e7–52b8.

passionate pining for philosophy (πόθῳ τῷ πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν *On Moral Progress* 77C6). We yearn for it when it is absent with a persistent, non-rational craving.[67]

In reverse order from what we saw before, instead of moving from rivalry with others to self-improvement, the desire for moral progress itself moves us to emulate those we see to be exemplary in their virtue. Plutarch later writes that this passion leads to the emulation of virtuous men because of yearning (διὰ πόθον), being full of an impulse that does not rest (μεστὸς ὢν ὁρμῆς οὐκ ἠρεμούσης) in longing to all but become one in nature with the good man (τῷ ἀγαθῷ μονονουχὶ συμφῦναι γλιχόμενος, 84D1–E1). We desire to be like the virtuous man, not to surpass him. True lovers of philosophy also "experience something like a kind of hunger and thirst in periods of separation" (πείνῃ τινὶ καὶ δίψῃ πάθος ὅμοιον ἐν τοῖς ἀποσπασμοῖς πάσχοντας, 77C8–10).[68] This desire seeks satisfaction in virtue, like an appetite.

Without this passionate longing, many will not follow through with an earnest pursuit of the virtuous life (76F1–77B2). When faced with trials and difficulties they eventually grow weary and give up (τελευτῶντες ἐξέκαμον καὶ ἀπηγόρευσαν, 77B2), as their initial eagerness

[67] Plutarch no doubt has the philosophic madness described in the *Phaedrus* in mind here (244a–45c). He is hesitant, however, to call this love a madness, since he reserves that term for love that is excessive beyond what is appropriate for a given object. Cf. Sandbach fr. 135 (from Plutarch's lost work, *On Love*)=Stob., 4.20.67: Some consider love a disease, others a madness, still others something divine; "Rightly some have thought that it is a desire when it begins, is a madness in excess, is friendship when reciprocated, is a weakness when lowly and is enthusiasm when it is prosperous" (ὀρθῶς ἐνίοις ἔδοξε τὸ μὲν ἀρχόμενον ἐπιθυμίαν εἶναι τὸ δ' ὑπερβάλλον μανίαν τὸ δ' ἀντίστροφον φιλίαν τὸ δὲ ταπεινότερον ἀρρωστίαν τὸ δ' εὐημεροῦν ἐνθουσιασμόν). *Contra* Wright 2008, pp. 140–1, I do not take Plutarch's description of a non-rational longing for philosophy to be an example of an ill-formed disposition. The passage and surrounding context do not lend themselves to that interpretation. It also would seem odd for Plutarch to claim that we could have an excessive desire for virtues or for philosophy. If we were to ask Plutarch if one's love for virtue and philosophy could be excessive, I suspect he would tell us that the demands of the object of love in these cases cannot be exceeded by human capacity. One cannot desire virtue or philosophy too much.

[68] Note that Plato's *Republic* sometimes uses the language of non-rational, appetitive desires for philosophy and virtue too: a true love for philosophy can strike one (ἔρως, 6, 499c1), one can become an ardent desirer of wisdom (σοφίας ἐπιθυμητής, 5, 475b8–9), as though with a desire belonging to the appetitive part of the soul (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν), and one can feel affection for wisdom (στέργειν, 7, 485c3–10).

withers away (τῆς προθυμίας οἷον ἀπομαραινομένης, 76F6–7).[69] Plutarch even advises that we take stock of our dispositions as we progress in virtue (ποιητέον ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ κρίσιν τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν διαθέσεως) to see whether we still have an enthusiasm for virtue and what is noble (ἀναλογιζόμενον…εἰ πρὸς ἀρετὴν καὶ τὸ καλὸν ἐνθουσιασμός, *On Listening to Lectures* 42A8–B2).

We might have expected Plutarch to appeal to a spirited emotion to help one weather difficulties and press on in pursuit of virtue. In Plato's *Republic*, the passion of courage helps one to stand fast and firm against adversities, enduring hardships to continue in the pursuit of what is noble (4, 442b10–c7).[70] But in [T57], the erotic desire for philosophy and virtue is more like the bestial drive of hunger that sends a lion through wind and rain in pursuit of flocks, even into the sheepfold where he faces potential danger (Homer, *Odyssey* 6.130–4).[71] The descriptions of passionate longing, hunger, and thirst for philosophy are typical of desires belonging to the appetitive part of the soul, not the spirited part.[72] These too, Plutarch indicates, can draw one in pursuit of moral progress and can even sustain one's pursuit in the face of difficulties.

§VI <u>That Life is Better with Passions Than Without Them</u>

Given the usefulness of passions for action, their ability to enhance actions, and their role in inciting and sustaining a desire for moral improvement, Plutarch argues that not only is it impossible to remove passions entirely from our lives, but also that life without passions would

[69] Cf. Wright 2008, pp. 141–2: "It is not only the case, though, that passions *may* assist in progressing toward virtue….Plutarch warns that absence or loss of passions for philosophy may lead to a person giving up the philosophical pursuit altogether."
[70] "And I suppose that we call each individual courageous in virtue of this part of the soul, whenever his spirited part preserves through pleasures and pains the command given by reason on what one should shrink back from or not" (καὶ ἀνδρεῖον δὴ οἶμαι τούτῳ τῷ μέρει καλοῦμεν ἕνα ἕκαστον, ὅταν αὐτοῦ τὸ θυμοειδὲς διασῴζῃ διά τε λυπῶν καὶ ἡδονῶν τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων παραγγελθὲν δεινόν τε καὶ μή, 442b10–c2).
[71] Cf. Fortenbaugh 1975, p. 34: Desire seems to be able to take the form of appetitive as well as more cognitive, spirited emotions.
[72] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 437d1–438a5.

not be better (οὔτ᾽ ἄμεινον). The rational part of the soul would not choose the elimination of passions to accomplish virtuous acts nor to escape interaction with the non-rational parts of the soul:

[T58] τοῦ λόγου…οὐ βουλομένου τὸ πάθος ἐξαιρεῖν παντάπασιν (οὔτε γὰρ δυνατὸν οὔτ᾽ ἄμεινον)

> Reason…does not desire to completely remove passion, since that is not possible and is *not better*. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 443C8–10)

We *should not desire* to suppress our passions because human life and moral virtue are *better* with passions, nor should one attempt to remove the *source* of passions from the soul (τὴν τοῦ πάθους ἀρχήν…ἀναιρετέαν παντάπασιν, *On Moral Virtue* 451C2–5).[73] The non-rational parts of the soul are inextricable from the embodied life and belong to it as natural additions to our rational nature, which are also serviceable, fitting, and beneficial.

As we saw in both Chapters 1 and 2, Plutarch believes that we forfeit good emotions if we try to void ourselves from the possibility of feeling painful passions entirely. The good outweighs the bad, and emotions such as love, joy, and benevolence must be protected and preserved above all else (παντὸς μᾶλλον διασῴζειν ἀναγκαῖον, *Letter of Consolation to Apollonius* 102C10–D2).[74] Further, these passions make life better in the value we attach to our shared emotional lives, as we already explored to some extent in Chapter 1. In his *Letter on Friendliness*, Plutarch writes that marriage is better with passion:

[T59] γάμος γὰρ ἀπὸ μὲν φιλίας διττῆς κράσεως βελτίων, ἑτέρως δὲ σφαλερός.

> A marriage is *better* if it comes from the mixing of affection from both sides; otherwise, it is on shaky ground. (Sandbach fr. 167=Stob. 4.28.8)

From this, Plutarch could mean little more than that marriage is better when it is mutual and

[73] =[T32] in Chapter 2.
[74] =[T22] in Chapter 2

when affection is not one-sided. If that were the case, then two equally disinterested persons might mutually agree to fulfill their marital duties to one another for the sake of utility and put their marriage on solid ground just as well as two lovers who equally share in their affection for one another. Dutiful execution would not be a completely passionless affair, since passions are necessary for action (§I), but it would not be motivated from affection, but perhaps from a desire to act appropriately toward one another.

Plutarch, however, has more than just mutual levels of (dis)interest in mind. In *On Moral Virtue*, Plutarch remarks that marriages conducted from a sense of duty, where the parties merely perform actions for one another in fitting and appropriate manners (καθηκόντως), often lead to something greater, an additional care and intimacy that grows into love and affection (τὸ φιλεῖν καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν, 448D10–F2).[75] The development is a positive addition. Emotional intimacy *enhances* our relationships. We are drawn together through love (ἔρως) and divinely inspired friendship (ἔνθεος φιλία, 452C–D), without which marriage is unstable.[76] This intimacy, moreover, is made possible by the addition of a passionate nature to our rational nature, which we might rightly call a gift from the gods that has been blended into our lives to make our shared life better (cf. Plutarch, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 50A2–5).[77]

Plutarch also stresses the point in *Advice to Bride and Groom*. Only through mutual love and affection is a couple able to become an intimate union, not merely a conjunction of discrete and separate individuals:

---

[75] Plutarch writes that marriages that do not produce children are no less improved and solidified by mutual affection than those that do (*Solon* 20.3). Cf. Håland 2011.

In *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.12, 1162a24–7, Aristotle writes that marriages, which seem to be based on utility and pleasure, may also advance to become friendships based on virtue (cf. Gould 1963, p. 145). Plutarch, interestingly, stresses the enhancement of marriage as a form of friendship, but its progression is to deeper intimacy and passion. Cf. Beneker 2012, pp. 23–4.

[76] Cf. Beneker 2012, pp. 7–39, esp. 31–9.

[77] =[T9] in Chapter 1.

[T60] τῶν σωμάτων οἱ φιλόσοφοι τὰ μὲν ἐκ διεστώτων λέγουσιν εἶναι καθάπερ στόλον καὶ στρατόπεδον, τὰ δ' ἐκ συναπτομένων ὡς οἰκίαν καὶ ναῦν, τὰ δ' ἡνωμένα καὶ συμφυῆ καθάπερ ἐστὶ τῶν ζῴων ἕκαστον. σχεδὸν οὖν καὶ γάμος ὁ μὲν τῶν ἐρώντων ἡνωμένος καὶ συμφυής ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ τῶν διὰ προῖκας ἢ τέκνα γαμούντων ἐκ συναπτομένων, ὁ δὲ τῶν συγκαθευδόντων ἐκ διεστώτων, οὓς συνοικεῖν ἄν τις ἀλλήλοις οὐ συμβιοῦν νομίσειε.

Philosophers say of bodies that some consist of separate objects, just like an army or encampment, while others consist of objects fastened together, like a house or a ship, and still others are united and naturally close-knit, just as is each animal. And then in nearly the same way, the marriage of those who are in love is united and naturally close-knit, but the marriage of those who wed for the sake of dowries or children consists of two parties fastened together, and the marriage of those who sleep together consists of separate individuals who live together with one another, one would think, but do not share their life together. (Plutarch, *Advice to Bride and Groom* 142E12–F8)

With these analogies of physical degrees of cohesion and unity,[78] Plutarch goes on to compare marriages founded on love and mutual affection with liquids whose distinct elements become indistinguishable as everything becomes shared in common (142F8–143A6). Passions complete our attempts to unify and share our lives with others beyond execution of duties we owe to one another, so that we may become a perfect union (δι' ὅλων κρᾶσις, *Dialogue on Love* 766F3–5).[79]

***

Plutarch argues that passions and our passionate nature are necessary for action in this life, but that they are not necessary evils of embodiment. The gods have added passions to our nature so that we can motivate our own actions and as aids in the pursuit of the moral life.

[78] Cf. the similar list of types of conjunction and union attributed to Chrysippus (Plutarch, *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 426A=*SVF* 2.367). Cf. also Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1078B–E=LS 48B and 48E; D.L. 7.151=LS 48A=*SVF* 2.479; Alexander of Aphrodisias, *On Mixture* 216.14–218.6=LS 48C=*SVF* 2.473; Stob. 1.17.4 (p. 155, ll. 5–11)=LS 48D=*SVF* 2.471.

[79] On the importance of ἔρως and affection in friendship, filial relations, and marriage in Plutarch's works see Brenk 1988 and 2000, and especially Beneker 2008 and 2012, pp. 7–56. I take up these points further in Chapter 6, §IV. For discussion of marriage in terms of gender roles and equality between husband and wife in Plutarch's works see Nikoleidis 1997; Moxnes 1997, pp. 280–2; Pomeroy 1999; Walcot 1999; McInerney 2003; Håland 2011. On Plutarch's representation of women in general see Le Corsu 1981. See also Badnall 2009, who argues that virtue is the offspring between men in Plutarch's *Dialogue on Love* and ironically not between husband and wife. *Contra* this view, I agree with Brenk 1988 and Crawford 1999, who defend Plutarch's praise of marriage as part of one's ascent to union with the divine.

Passions add impetus to action, intensify virtue, and can be used to encourage self-improvement through healthy rivalry and emulation. They can even serve as a driving force, like a hunger and thirst, that pushes us to endure difficulties on the path to virtue. All in all, Plutarch writes, it is not possible to live without passions. Even if we could, we would not want to, since passions make life better.

CHAPTER 4

Restraint and Cognitive Emotions

As we explored in the last chapter, passions can contribute to moral progress. They do not, however, always help us on the path to virtue. They can also lead us astray. In this chapter, we will look at a further contribution that certain passions can play in moral development by suppressing other passions that are misaligned. As we will explore in the first section, when strong errant passions arise in the soul, other passions, such as shame and anger, can provide a strong countering force to restrain them. In cases where we find desires and appetites at odds with our rational intentions, this positive role is particularly beneficial as a source of added force in correcting errant desires. It is not readily apparent in either Plato's or Plutarch's descriptions of shame and anger, however, whether the spirited part of the soul, to which these emotions belong, is responsible for the evaluation of errant appetitive desires *as* shameful and wrong.

In the second section of this chapter, I present evidence that the spirited part of the soul is capable of retaining evaluative standards to judge errant desires and that it can use these standards independently of the rational part of the soul. Plutarch's view of psychological development, which follows Plato's *Republic* and *Laws*, holds that the spirited part of the soul is active before the advent of reason in children and that it is the target of early education, a point that I explore in greater detail in Chapter 5. During sleep, spirited passions can also help to restrain errant desires even when the rational part of the soul is inactive and, as it were, also asleep. Plutarch describes the spirited part of the soul as capable of guiding the soul as a whole

without reason, like beasts whose leader lets loose the reins, who continue along the path initially set by their leader, i.e. the rational part of the soul, without further instruction.

In the third section of this chapter, I provide a short synopsis on the Platonic background of the evaluative capacities of non-rational passions such as shame. (A more fully developed analysis is provided in the appendix to this chapter.) Though there are a few hints that the non-rational parts of the soul themselves may have the capacity to form beliefs and evaluate actions and desires, it will emerge from this quick excursus that Plato's dialogues seem to present a strong case that all evaluation and judgment is conducted by the rational part of the soul and that non-rational passions are purely reactive. I call this a "top-down" view, where all information, including what is gathered from sense-perception, is passed down to the non-rational parts of the soul from the rational part of the soul. Spirited and appetitive passions are responsive to particular types of content, but they do not appear to be able to form beliefs nor to evaluate other passions in the absence of commands coming down from the citadel, as it were, of the rational part of the soul (*Timaeus* 70a2–b5).

In the fourth section, we will look at how Plutarch adapts certain aspects of Platonic psychology together with Aristotle's argument that the non-rational part of the soul participates in reason in a way (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13). For Plutarch, the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul are non-rational insofar as they are distinct from the rational part of the soul, but they are not *wholly* non-rational, since they are capable of listening to and obeying reason. The nutritive / vegetative and sense-perceptive parts of the soul, in contrast, are wholly non-rational for Plutarch.

Unlike Aristotle, Plutarch distinguishes the spirited part of the soul from the appetitive part by the degree to which it participates in reason, which I discuss in the fifth section. Spirited

emotions are capable of responding to and internalizing more complex cognitive content, which includes evaluative standards of honor and shame. The appetitive part of the soul may have representations of objects that are intentional, but it does not evaluate actions or desires in terms of what is noble or shameful. Nor does it respond to these features.

The sixth section focuses on examples of emotions to draw out different features of the representational content involved in spirited emotions. The desire for honor and the emotion of shame involve representations of others as an audience or an ideal image of what is honorable. Emotions such as anger, hate, and envy involve the evaluation of actions or character in terms of what is honorable or shameful.

In the final section I return to Plutarch's examples of early education and the suppression of errant desires by the spirited part of the soul when the rational part of the soul is inactive and asleep. I first explore the spirited part of the soul's internalization of standards of honor and shame. Plutarch describes the training of the non-rational part of the soul as a form of habituation, but this habituation, as in the *Republic*, involves the inculcation of certain beliefs that govern one's behavior, evaluating actions in terms of whether they are honorable or shameful. In the analogy of the beasts that pull a cart when the leader lets loose the reins, spirited passions, like this team of animals, continue to evaluate desires within the soul during sleep and to apply internalized standards to judge appetitive desires, approving of what is appropriate while restraining what is not. The spirited part of the soul has a capacity not only to retain and internalize standards of evaluation or instructions, but also a capacity to evaluate desires and actions in terms of whether they are shameful or acceptable. It may also be able to form new beliefs.

§I Rational Restraint and Passionate Restraint of Errant Desires

In this section, we will look at the positive feature of passionate correction in both Plato's dialogues and Plutarch's psychology. First, we will analyze the rational part of the soul's correction of errant appetitive desires, which provides a basic model that correction of desires through other passions follows. The spirited part of the soul, like the rational part, restrains and suppresses appetitive desires when they are deemed inappropriate. Since the rational part of the soul is the weakest part in most humans compared to the strength of appetitive desires, spirited passions serve an important function in adding greater force to restrain inappropriate desires.

In both Plato's and Plutarch's works, the rational part of the soul constrains and counters errant desires when they are set against its own better, rational intention and judgment (παρὰ τὸν λογισμόν, Plato, *Republic* 4, 440b1; παρὰ γνώμην, Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 447D7–8).[1] Aristotle likewise recognizes this opposition in his discussion of psychic conflict: within the soul there is "something apart from reason, opposing and resisting it" (τι παρὰ τὸν λόγον, ἐναντιούμενον τούτῳ καὶ ἀντιβαῖνον, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1102b24–5), and this part "fights and opposes reason" (μάχεται καὶ ἀντιτείνει τῷ λόγῳ, b16–18). Plutarch describes this experience with the balance-beam metaphor: reason must counterbalance the forceful weight exerted by one of the passionate parts of soul when critical psychic conflict occurs (*On Moral Virtue* 447D6–9).[2] This image is reminiscent of the opposing forces of reason and passion seen in *Republic* 4's Principle of Opposites passage.[3] There, in the first example used to distinguish the rational part of the soul from the appetitive part, the rational part of the soul provides an internal counter-motion against the motivations of the appetitive part of the soul, halting the desire from

[1] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 436b9–439d8.
[2] See §IV in Chapter 3.
[3] See §III in Chapter 1.

issuing in action (*Republic* 4, 436b9–439d8).

Plutarch, following Platonic precedent, also describes the countervailing action of the rational part of the soul in terms of *restraint* and *constraint* of appetitive desires:

[T61] ἐκπονεῖν χρὴ καὶ ἀποκόπτειν αὐτὰς [τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, 584E7] ἀνείρξεσι καὶ κατοχαῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου κολαζομένας. δίψαν ἐκβιάζεται καὶ πεῖναν ἡ πρὸς τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν ἀντίβασις τοῦ λογισμοῦ.

> One ought to wear out and remove desires, constrained by reason through acts of restraint and repression. Resistance of the rational part against nourishment and drink constrains thirst and hunger. (Plutarch, *On the Sign of Socrates* 584E8–F1)

Reason (λόγος), or the rational part of the soul (τὸ λογιστικόν), constrains the appetitive desires by holding them down (κατέχειν) and forcing them back (ἀνείργειν).[4] It must continue this activity until the desires of the appetitive part cease to present strong opposition, being, as it were, exhausted. Failing their exhaustion, the rational part will overcome the desires of the other parts of the soul, dragging them (ἐφέλκειν) while they continue to resist (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 448B3–5[5]; cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 439b3–5[6]).

By removal (ἀποκόπτειν), Plutarch seems to mean (i) suppressing errant passions until they cease to present opposition, (ii) diverting them toward different objects, (iii) removing some excess from them to make them moderate, or (iv) transforming them into different passions. For Plutarch, there is a great deal of overlap between (ii)–(iv). Certain errant passions are transformed into more innocuous passions because the errant passions are themselves excessive

[4] While for Plutarch the rational part of the soul cannot motivate practical actions without the impulse of non-rational passions (See §I in Chapter 3), it does not lack psychic force to oppose desires and impulses and stop them from issuing in practical actions.

[5] "For if, in fact, one [part of the soul] overcomes the other, it does not destroy the other part, but [what is overcome] is *dragged*, being constrained although still presenting opposition" (καὶ γὰρ ἂν περιγένηται θάτερον, οὐκ ἀνῄρηκε θάτερον, ἀλλ᾽ <u>ἐφέλκεται</u> καταβιαζόμενον καὶ ἀντιτεῖνον).

[6] "Would it not be the case that if ever something *draws* the soul itself *in the opposite direction* when it is thirsty, that what draws away is something different within the soul from the part that is thirsty and leads the soul like a beast to drink?" (οὐκοῦν εἴ ποτέ τι αὐτὴν <u>ἀνθέλκει</u> διψῶσαν, ἕτερον ἄν τι ἐν αὐτῇ εἴη αὐτοῦ τοῦ διψῶντος καὶ ἄγοντος ὥσπερ θηρίον ἐπὶ τὸ πιεῖν;)

forms of passions that admit of moderate states. Envy (φθόνος), for instance, has no place in the moral life (*On Listening to Lectures* 39D8–10) and is an excessive and misdirected form of the desire for honor (φιλοτιμία), which can be moderate (39E8–11; *Precepts of Statecraft* 820A2–B1).[7] Envy must be curbed and pruned back. This curbing of excess coincides with the redirection of a misplaced desire for praise and reputation to a correct sense of honor tied to virtue (*Alcibiades* 1.1; *Agis and Cleomenes* 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2).[8] Curbing excess and redirecting passions in this way can amount to the transformation of errant passions into more suitable, moderate passions (εἰς ἐπιεικέστερα πάθη μεθισταμένη, *On Moral Progress* 84A1–12). If correctly redirected and curbed, for instance, envy can be transformed back into a desire for honor.[9]

Sometimes reason is not strong enough to suppress passions opposed to our better judgment and cannot divert or convert them. An appetitive desire, for example, can pull us away from the correct course determined by reason, as though weighing down one side of a scale in Plutarch's balance-beam metaphor (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 447F1–4). Plutarch, following Plato's *Republic*, considers experiences of this kind to be common. The appetitive part of the soul, which is largest in most individuals (Plato, *Republic* 4, 442a5–6), is generally stronger compared to the rational part, which is smallest in most individuals (Plato, *Republic* 4, 442c4; 9, 588d2–3).[10] Given this general condition of the human psyche, many of us have strong appetites that challenge our self-mastery and rational resolve. Plutarch goes so far as to say that most of us

[7] See §VI and nn. 108–9 of Chapter 2 for more citations and discussion of these passages.
[8] The misdirection also occurs in the *inappropriate* desire for reputation and a desire for honor that is itself *unjust* (φιλοδοξία ἄκαιρος καὶ φιλοτιμία ἄδικος, *On Listening to Lectures* 39E8–11). I take up many of these points in §I.a. of Chapter 6. See also Plutarch, *How to Profit by One's Enemies* 92A3–B10 and *On Listening to Lectures* 38C10–D7, quoted and discussed in §I.b. of Chapter 6.
[9] See §VI and nn. 106–9 in Chapter 2.
[10] Cf. Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* 3, 1002B2–7.

struggle to deliberate well due to the interference of passions (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 448A9–B2).[11]

Fortunately, one is not stranded and inevitably forced to act contrary to rational judgment if the rational part of one's soul is too weak to oppose the desire effectively: the weight and force of *another* non-rational passion can be used to tip the scales in the better direction. More specifically, the "spirited part of the soul" (τὸ θυμοειδές) can aid our rational decisions in "providing strength and power to the rational part of the soul against the appetitive part of the soul" (τῷ λογισμῷ παρέχον ἰσχὺν ἐπὶ τοῦτο [τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, 442A7] καὶ δύναμιν, *On Moral Virtue* 442A8–9). Spirited passions can thus be used to counterbalance the force and strength of errant appetitive passions, i.e. can join in adding force to our rational judgments (cf. *On Moral Virtue* 449C2–3).[12]

Plutarch, following Plato's dialogues,[13] characterizes the spirited part of the soul (τὸ θυμοειδές) and its passions as naturally allied (σύμμαχον) to the rational part of the soul (*Platonic Questions* 9, 1008C5–11=[T63] below; Sandbach fr. 148[14]). The spirited part of the soul is the ally of our rational nature according to Plutarch, helping to chastise errant appetitive desires:

---

[11] "For most people, their practical deliberations, judgments, and ways of doing things, because they are in a state of passion, provide impediment and difficulty for reason, which is hindered and disturbed by the non-rational that, together with some pleasure, fear, pain, or desire, opposes reason" (αἱ δὲ πραγματικαὶ βουλαὶ καὶ κρίσεις καὶ δίαιται τῶν πολλῶν ἐμπαθεῖς οὖσαι δυσοδίαν τῷ λόγῳ παρέχουσι καὶ δυσκολίαν, ἐνισχομένῳ καὶ ταραττομένῳ περὶ τὸ ἄλογον, ἀνταῖρον αὐτῷ μεθ' ἡδονῆς τινος ἢ δέους ἢ λύπης ἢ ἐπιθυμίας). For Plutarch, as in Plato's dialogues, anger and appetites can obstruct deliberation because they can focus our attention on details that are salient to the representational content of that particular emotion or desire to the exclusion of other considerations that are important to that deliberation (cf. Bobonich 2002, p. 345). See §A.IV. in the Appendix. Passions do not *always* obstruct our decisions, as we saw in §IV of Chapter 3, where certain passions, including instances of anger, increase the force of a decision *together with* rational inclination (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 448D7–10=[T54]). As I argue in the next chapter, passions may also help draw our attention to faults so that we can reflect on them with the rational part of the soul and correct them (§IV of Chapter 5).

[12] This passage is quoted and translated as part of [T65] below.

[13] *Republic* 4, 439e5–441a3, 441e4–5, 442b7–8, 442c1–2; 9, 589b3–4; cf. *Timaeus* 70e2–7.

[14] From Plutarch's lost work *On Rage*=Stob. 3.20.70.

[T62] τῷ μὲν λογιστικῷ τὸ ἄρχειν τῷ δὲ θυμοειδεῖ τὸ ἄρχεσθαι καὶ τὸ ἄρχειν κατὰ φύσιν ἐστίν, ὑπηκόῳ μὲν ὄντι τοῦ λογισμοῦ κρατοῦντι δὲ καὶ κολάζοντι τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὅταν ἀπειθῇ τῷ λογισμῷ.

It is natural for the rational part to rule and for the spirited part to be ruled and to rule in turn, since it is obedient to the rational part and masters and chastises the appetitive part of the soul whenever it disobeys the rational part.

(Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008B7–10)

The spirited part stands in an intermediate position of being ruled and ruling and has this favored position over the appetitive part in virtue of its more obedient nature toward reason. The term that Plutarch uses to describe its obedience, ὑπήκοον, is one that carries with it the sense that one subjects oneself and takes a position under another (ὑπό-) to take heed and listen (ἀκούειν) to the dictates of a superior. The obedient nature of the spirited part thus seems to be connected not only with the fact that it goes along with what the rational part of the soul is doing, but also with its *receptiveness* to the commands issued from the rational part.[15]

We gather more on the sense of the spirited part's receptivity to commands in another passage in Plutarch's *Platonic Questions*. Drawing upon the *Phaedrus*' Myth of the Charioteer, Plutarch writes:

[T63] καὶ Πλάτων αὐτὸς εἰκάσας συμφύτῳ ζεύγει καὶ ἡνιόχῳ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς εἶδος, ἡνίοχον μέν, ὡς παντὶ δῆλον, ἀπέφηνε τὸ λογιστικόν· τῶν δ' ἵππων τὸ μὲν περὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἀπειθὲς καὶ ἀνάγωγον παντάπασι "περὶ ὦτα λάσιον, κωφόν, μάστιγι μετὰ κέντρων μόγις ὑπεῖκον," τὸ δὲ θυμοειδὲς εὐήνιον τὰ πολλὰ τῷ λογισμῷ καὶ σύμμαχον.[16]

And Plato himself, likening the form of the soul to a pair of horses yoked together and a charioteer [*Phaedrus* 246a6–7],[17] represented the rational part of the soul in the guise of the charioteer, as is clear to everyone, while of the two horses he made the one "shaggy around the ears, deaf, and hardly yielding to the whip with goads" [*Phaedrus* 253e4–5][18]

[15] Plutarch also appears to draw upon Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, for this view and uses similar terminology. I discuss these points further in §IV.

[16] I have deleted what appears to be an extraneous comma after ψυχῆς in Hubert's edition of the text, since I take it that εἶδος is the noun modified by τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς.

[17] "Let it [the soul] be like the combined force of a yoked team of winged horses and a charioteer" (ἐοικέτω δὴ συμφύτῳ δυνάμει ὑποπτέρου ζεύγους τε καὶ ἡνιόχου).

[18] Plutarch has modified the case of the adjectives and participle from nominate to accusative. Otherwise, the quotation is verbatim.

> the disobedient and entirely unmanageable part concerned with appetites, but the spirited part he represented as the one that for the most part easily yields to the reins of the rational part and is his ally. (Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008C5–11)

While appetites are more unruly and disobedient to reason, which leads to instances in which appetitive desires counter our better rational judgment, the non-rational spirited part is far more obedient and amenable to the commands of our rational aspect. The spirited horse, as the spirited part of the soul, for the most part yields, or is obedient to the direction it received through the reins (εὐήνιον). It has a greater capacity not only to give way (ὑπείκειν) to reason, responding quickly when being reined in, but also seems more naturally attentive to the directions it receives, taking heed and responding quickly to indications that the rational part wants to change direction with a pull of the reins this way or that. The spirited part of the soul also seems, once again, to *listen* to the commands of the rational part of the soul, in contradistinction to the nearly deaf (κωφόν) nature of the appetitive part of the soul,[19] which is too shaggy around the ears to listen to the commands of reason, so much so that it often requires more forceful measures, such as a whip with stinging goads (μάστιγι μετὰ κέντρων) to bring it in line with the rational part of the soul's intentions.[20]

Plutarch does not indicate, however, that the non-rational appetitive part of soul always disobeys the rational part of the soul. In [T63] the spirited part masters and chastises the appetitive part of the soul *whenever* (ὅταν) it is disobedient to the rational part, but that need not always be the case.[21] As in the *Republic*'s metaphor of the inner man (representing the rational

[19] In the contrast between listening and being deaf to reason, Plutarch, again, seems to draw upon Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, but Plutarch uses the distinction differently from what we find in that passage, which I discuss in §IV below.

[20] See Yunis 2011 on Plato, *Phaedrus* 254e5: "[T]he beast is tamed, physical pain…being the only language it understands."

[21] Note also that in *Timaeus* 70a2–7 (which is part of [A13]), Socrates remarks that the spirited part of the soul is obedient and holds the common objective of suppressing the desires of the appetitive part whenever (ὁπότ') they are unwilling to obey reason: "Therefore the part that has a share of courage and anger, since it is victory-loving, they [the gods] made to dwell closer to the head between the midriff and neck [than the worse part of the mortal kind of

part of the soul), the inner lion (representing the spirited part) and the many-headed beast (representing the appetitive part, *Republic* 9, 589a6–b6), the end-goal to be achieved is friendship among the parts of the soul working in harmony (φίλα, Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 446D1–E2).[22]

While in the virtuous state of the soul appetitive desires are obedient and subservient to the rational part of the soul, even contributing in practical judgments as fellow-workers (συνεργά ταῖς πρακτικαῖς προαιρέσεσιν, Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 446D1–E2),[23] neither

---

soul] in order that, since it is obedient to reason, it might suppress with a forcefulness together with reason the group of desires *whenever* they are entirely unwilling, as far as they are concerned, to obey any of the commands from the central governance of the soul and reason" (τὸ μετέχον οὖν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀνδρείας καὶ θυμοῦ, φιλόνικον ὄν, κατῴκισαν ἐγγυτέρω τῆς κεφαλῆς μεταξὺ τῶν φρενῶν τε καὶ αὐχένος, ἵνα τοῦ λόγου κατήκοον ὂν κοινῇ μετ' ἐκείνου βίᾳ τὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν κατέχοι γένος, ὁπότ' ἐκ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τῷ τ' ἐπιτάγματι καὶ λόγῳ μηδαμῇ πείθεσθαι ἐκὸν ἐθέλοι).

[22] "Upon seeing the entirely even-tempered, calm, and sound condition of the moderate person's soul [in contrast to the continent man's agitation], through which the non-rational part of the soul has been brought into harmony and friendly communion with the rational part, since the non-rational part has been arranged in ready obedience and with a gentleness to be marveled at, upon seeing that you would say, 'Then, indeed, the gust didst cease, and a windless calm there was, and a divine spirit put to rest the waves,' [Homer, *Odyssey* 12.168] once the rational part of the soul had quelled the violent, insane, and frantic disturbances of the desires and made these desires, which nature required of necessity, sympathetic, obedient, *friendly*, and *cooperative* with the practical intentions of reason. Consequently, these desires did not run past reason, falter, rebel due to a lack of discipline, or disobey, but every impulse was easily led 'as a weaned calf runs alongside the mare' [Semonides fr. 5=Stob. 5.50.19 (p. 1024, l. 10)]" (τῆς δὲ σώφρονος ψυχῆς τὸ πανταχόθεν ὁμαλὲς καὶ ἄσφυκτον καὶ ὑγιαῖνον, ᾧ συνήρμοσται καὶ συγκέκραται τὸ ἄλογον πρὸς τὸν λογισμὸν εὐπειθείᾳ καὶ πραότητι θαυμαστῇ κεκοσμημένον, εἴποις ἂν ἐπιβλέψας 'δὴ τότ' ἔπειτ' ἄνεμος μὲν ἐπαύσατο, ἡ δὲ γαλήνη ἔπλετο νηνεμίη, κοίμησε δὲ κύματα δαίμων', τὰ σφοδρὰ καὶ περιμανῆ καὶ οἰστρώδη κινήματα τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τοῦ λόγου κατασβέσαντος, ὧν δ' ἡ φύσις ἀναγκαίως δεῖται, ταῦθ' ὁμοπαθῆ καὶ ὑπήκοα καὶ φίλα καὶ συνεργὰ πεποιημένου ταῖς πρακτικαῖς προαιρέσεσιν, ὥστε μὴ προεκθεῖν τοῦ λογισμοῦ μηδ' ὑπενδιδόναι μηδ' ἀτακτεῖν μηδ' ἀπειθεῖν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν ὁρμὴν εὐάγωγον οὖσαν 'ἄθηλον ἵππῳ πῶλον ὡς ἅμα τρέχειν'). In the virtuous state of soul, non-rational passions, both spirited and appetitive, are obedient, friendly, and fellow-workers in agreement with decisions of the rational part of the soul. While in an immoderate condition the appetitive part of the soul is entirely unmanageable (ἀνάγωγος παντάπασι, *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008C8 in [T63]), in the virtuous state, even it is easily led (εὐάγωγος, 446E1) and arranged in ready obedience (εὐπειθείᾳ 446D3) to the rational part of the soul. Cf. *On Moral Virtue* 448D7–10=[T54] in Chapter 3.

Pace Duff 1999, p. 73, I take it that Plutarch is not deviating too far from his Platonic sources in thinking that the appetitive part of the soul is also capable of obeying and becoming friendly with the rational part of the soul. Duff (1999, p. 73) claims that in Plato's works, the appetitive part of the soul is completely irrational in the sense of non-compliant with the rational part of the soul: "For Plato, the 'appetitive' is the purely irrational part of the soul and capable only of responding to bodily instincts. The 'spirited' part of the soul (τὸ θυμοειδές), or the 'spirit' (θυμός), is for Plato that part which reacts emotionally to a sense of right and wrong…." It is not clear to me that Duff is right to emphasize the stubborn nature of the appetitive part of the soul to such an extreme, since in *Republic* 9, we get the picture of a morally virtuous soul in which the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul have become friends (φιλά) with the rational part of the soul (589a6–b6).

[23] See the preceding note.

Plutarch nor Plato's dialogues refer to the appetitive part as an ally to the rational part of the soul. The alliance of the spirited part of the soul is reserved for situations in which appetitive desires disobey or neglect the dictates of reason. In those instances, conflict arises, and the alliance of the spirited part exists to help quell the desires and passions pulling off course. This is not to say that the spirited part is always in agreement with the rational part of the soul, but even when conflict occurs between those two, we get no indication that the appetitive part of the soul joins forces with the rational part of the soul against our spirited passions.[24] The spirited part of the soul has a special place in Plutarch's and Plato's moral psychology in contrast with the appetitive part of the soul. Appetite would not come to the aid of reason if our spirited emotions were excessive, misdirected, or in any other way errant. Only the spirited part is able to listen to reason and contribute to its efforts to steer the soul in the right direction.[25]

§II Spirited Passions in Lieu of Reason

Plutarch indicates that spirited emotions play an important role in moral development *before* the advent of reason in children. He does not suggest that children entirely lack the

[24] In *On Moral Virtue* 442A7–8, Plutarch notes that the spirited part of the soul sometimes allies itself to the appetitive part of the soul, though in Plato's *Republic* (4, 440ba6–b6), Socrates and Glaucon agree that they have not observed instances in which the spirited part allies itself with the appetitive part against the rational part in themselves nor have they seen this occurring in other individuals. *Pace* Opsomer 2012, p. 322, and Vander Waerdt 1985a, p. 380, who believe that Plutarch deviates from Plato's *Republic* on this point, note that in 4, 440e1–5, Socrates and Glaucon agree that although they at first considered the spirited part to be something appetitive (ἐπιθυμητικόν τι), they now agree that "in the civil strife of the soul, it fights on the side of reason far more often" (πολὺ μᾶλλον αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς στάσει τίθεσθαι τὰ ὅπλα πρὸς τὸ λογιστικόν, e3–4). This does not preclude the possibility that the spirited part of the soul *sometimes* allies itself with the appetitive part, if we read πολὺ μᾶλλον as indicating frequency, as I have taken it to mean "far more often." It, in fact, implies that spirit does *sometimes* ally itself with appetite. It just is *far more often* the case that the spirited part is allied with the rational part. This seems to me the correct reading, since alliance is bivalent in nature and does not come in degrees, though one could be inconsistent, reluctant, or unreliable in giving aid as an ally. Nevertheless, one allies oneself with one side *or* another at a given time. As expressed here more literally, one "takes up arms for" one side at any point in time. For the interpretation of μᾶλλον as indicating frequency (or probability) instead of degree see Dik 2014.

[25] As I explore below in §V, this is partly explained by the greater ability of the spirited part of the soul to *understand* the dictates of reason. The rational part of the soul is best able to see what is fitting for each part of the soul and the soul as a whole (*Republic* 4, 441e3–4; 9, 586d4–587a2), and the spirited part, following and heeding its commands, has some ability to understand what is better for the appetites, namely, in terms of whether they are shameful, whereas appetites are concerned with satisfaction. See also n. 32 in Chapter 3.

rational part of the soul for it to suddenly appear at some point in their development. Instead, certain rational capacities develop over time and are nascent but inactive in our earliest years of development.[26] The rational part of the soul is essential to the human embodied condition from birth,[27] but many of its powers aimed at deliberation and contemplation are not active from the inception of life and only develop much later. Plutarch, drawing upon Plato's view of rational development, holds that spirited emotions, unlike reason, are strong from birth.[28]

Early education, aimed at guiding one's habits and behavior, shapes spirited passions, which in turn have a strong grip and guiding force on the direction one's character will take, points that I explore in detail in Chapter 5.[29] For now, I want to note that educators use emotions such as shame and the desire for honor to shape the way that children act, not only steering them this way or that when they correct particular actions, but also so that they can self-regulate their own actions and desires. Children internalize standards of what is appropriate and inappropriate and what is shameful and honorable so that they are able to feel shame toward inappropriate desires, and guide their own behavior even when their parents or instructors are not giving

---

[26] *On Being a Busybody* 520D3–7; *Lycurgus and Numa* 4.4–5. We are not born with fully functional rational capacities (cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 441a7–b1 and *Laws* 7, 808d1–e4), but instead develop our abilities to understand instruction, calculate, reason, and determine our own courses of action as we mature (Plutarch, *On Listening to Lectures* 37D11–E3). Cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 7.15, 1334b17–28. On the Stoic view cf. Aetius 4.11.1–4=*SVF* 2.83=LS 39E; Epictetus, *Discourses* 1.6.12–22=LS 63E.

[27] Plutarch, *On the Sign of Socrates* 591D5–7=[T31] in Chapter 2; *On the Face in the Moon* 943A6–7; Sandbach fr. 144; *On Moral Virtue* 441D4–6; *On Isis and Osiris* 382F. See also §IV of Chapter 2.

[28] See Plato, *Laws* 2, 653a5–c4 and 659c9–e5. In the *Republic*, Socrates notes that certain individuals may never fully mature in rational capacities. Cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 441a7–b1 and 9, 590c8–d6. Cf. also Aristotle, *Politics* 1.13, 1260a12–14: "For, the slave does not have the deliberative element of the soul at all, but the female has it, though not properly, while the child has it, but only as incomplete" (ὁ μὲν γὰρ δοῦλος ὅλως οὐκ ἔχει τὸ βουλευτικόν, τὸ δὲ θῆλυ ἔχει μέν, ἀλλ' ἄκυρον, ὁ δὲ παῖς ἔχει μέν, ἀλλ' ἀτελές) and *Politics* 1.13, 1260a34, b3–8; *Nicomachean Ethics* 3.1, 1111a25–6; 3.2, b8–9; 6.13, 1144b8; 7.3, 1147b5 and *Eudemian Ethics* 2.8, 1224a25–30, and 7.6, 1240b31–4. Cf. Sherman 1989, pp. 160–1: Sherman argues that the denial of reason to children should not be taken without qualification, since Aristotle does have in mind that children develop these capacities. Thus, he writes that children have these capacities to some extent, but in an incomplete form, as we see in *Politics* 1.13, 1260a34–6. Cf. Fortenbaugh 1975, pp. 45–53.

[29] See Plutarch, *Can Virtue be Taught* 439F2–5, *On Moral Virtue* 452D7–8. Cf. Plato, *Republic* 2, 377c3–6.

particular commands, praise, or reprimands.[30]

These evaluative activities are cognitive in nature. They involve representations of actions and desires *as* honorable or shameful, appropriate or inappropriate, and they guide our responses and future actions. We learn to self-regulate our actions even as our educators let loose the reins, as it were, and before our own rational part takes them up. Since they occur, operate, and are formed before the advent of reason and our rational powers, they do not belong to the rational part of the soul. They belong to the spirited part of the soul which concerns itself with honor and shame and is very strong in children from their birth before reason. I will address more on *how* this occurs in the soul for Plutarch in §VII. Here, I want to set out the evidence for these capacities as features of the non-rational spirited part of the soul.

A second important piece of evidence is found in Plutarch's remarks on how spirited emotions regulate desires in one's sleep, when the rational part of the soul is not giving commands to the passionate parts since it is itself asleep. With a metaphor of a trained team of horses, Plutarch writes that the non-rational parts of the soul, if properly trained and obedient, hold fast to the beliefs about what is permissible and what is shameful during periods in which the rational part of the soul is inactive.

Drawing on a passage from Plato's *Republic* (9, 571b2–572b6), Plutarch describes the indulgence in lawless desires of the tyrannical soul's non-rational part during sleep (τῆς φύσει τυραννικῆς ψυχῆς τὸ ἄλογον κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους, *On Moral Progress* 83A3–4), but notes that properly trained non-rational passions can *guard against* such desires even in one's dreams.[31]

---

[30] I explore these points in §II of Chapter 5.

[31] See also Plutarch's *On Virtue and Vice* 100F9–101B: "And thus envy and fear and anger and lack of restraint dispose one [to be miserable in dreams]. For, during the day, looking out and making one resemble others in appearance, vice is shy and hides its passions, and does not entirely give itself up to impulses but opposes and often struggles against them, but then in sleep, fleeing from the opinions of others and the laws and being very far removed from feeling fear and a sense of shame, it stirs up every desire and awakens wickedness and licentiousness.

The non-rational part of the tyrant's soul

[T64] "μητρί τε γὰρ ἐπιχειρεῖ μίγνυσθαι" καὶ περὶ βρώσεις ὁρμᾷ παντοδαπάς, παρανομοῦν καὶ χρώμενον ἑαυτοῦ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις οἷον λελυμέναις, ἃς μεθ' ἡμέραν ὁ νόμος αἰσχύνῃ καὶ φόβῳ καθείργνυσιν. ὥσπερ οὖν τὰ πεπαιδευμένα καλῶς τῶν ὑποζυγίων, οὐδ' ἂν ἀφῇ τὰς ἡνίας ὁ ἄρχων, ἐπιχειρεῖ παρατρέπεσθαι καὶ ἀπολείπειν τὴν ὁδόν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἴθισται πρόεισιν ἐν τάξει, διαφυλάττοντα τὴν πορείαν ἄπταιστον, οὕτως οἷς ἂν εὐπειθὲς τὸ ἄλογον ἤδη καὶ πρᾶον ᾖ γεγονὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου καὶ κεκολασμένον, οὔτε καθ' ὕπνους οὔθ' ὑπὸ νόσων ἔτι ῥᾳδίως ἐξυβρίζειν ἢ παρανομεῖν ἐθέλει ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ τηρεῖ καὶ διαμνημονεύει τὸν ἐθισμόν, ἰσχὺν ἐμποιοῦντα τῇ προσοχῇ καὶ τόνον.

"attempts to have sex with his mother" [*Republic* 9, 571d1] and rushes after every kind of food, transgressing laws and enjoying, as it were, its unrestrained desires, which the law prohibits through shame and fear under the light of day. Therefore, just as beasts of burden that have been well trained do not attempt to turn aside or abandon the path if their leader lets loose the reins, but instead proceed in order just as they have become accustomed to do, maintaining the course without error, in the same way, whoever has had their non-rational part of soul already made tame and disciplined by reason, it [their non-rational part of soul] is not readily willing in sleep nor still in the throes of illness to act insolently or lawlessly due to desires, but it carefully guards and holds fast to the memory of what has become its accustomed habit, implanting strength and intensity to our diligence. (Plutarch, *On Moral Progress* 83A4–B8)

The well-trained non-rational part of the soul guards (τηρεῖ) and holds fast to the memory (διαμνημονεύει) of what it has received in its education by reason. What is meant here in "made tame and disciplined by reason" is somewhat ambiguous. By reason (ὁ λόγος), Plutarch could mean the rational part of one's own soul, but I think it probable that he also includes reason in the sense of the rational guidance of one's educators who have shaped one's passions from birth,

---

It 'attempts to have sex with one's mother,' as Plato says, and pursues unlawful meats and does not hold off from doing any action, taking enjoyment in illegal activity as much as it is able with images and appearances that do not come to fulfillment in any pleasure or in the cessation of what desires, but are able only to stir up and greatly incite passions and diseases" (οὕτω δὲ καὶ φθόνος καὶ φόβος καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ἀκολασία διατίθησι. μεθ' ἡμέραν μὲν γὰρ ἔξω βλέπουσα καὶ συσχηματιζομένη πρὸς ἑτέρους ἡ κακία δυσωπεῖται καὶ παρακαλύπτει τὰ πάθη, καὶ οὐ παντάπασι ταῖς ὁρμαῖς ἐκδίδωσιν ἑαυτὴν ἀλλ' ἀντιτείνει καὶ μάχεται πολλάκις· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ὕπνοις ἀποφυγοῦσα δόξας καὶ νόμους καὶ ῥορωτάτω γενομένη τοῦ δεδιέναι τε καὶ αἰδεῖσθαι, πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν κινεῖ καὶ ἐπανεγείρει τὸ κακόηθες καὶ ἀκόλαστον. "μητρί τε γὰρ ἐπιχειρεῖ μίγνυσθαι," ὥς φησιν ὁ Πλάτων, καὶ βρώσεις ἀθέσμους προσφέρεται καὶ πράξεως οὐδεμιᾶς ἀπέχεται, ἀπολαύουσα τοῦ παρανομεῖν ὡς ἀνυστόν ἐστιν εἰδώλοις καὶ φάσμασιν εἰς οὐδεμίαν ἡδονὴν οὐδὲ τελείωσιν τοῦ ἐπιθυμοῦντος τελευτῶσιν, ἀλλὰ κινεῖν μόνον καὶ διαγριαίνειν τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰ νοσήματα δυναμένοις).

as I mentioned above and will discuss further in Chapter 5. Reason in this sense belongs to another person, as described in Plato's *Republic* 9, where those who are deficient in their own rational powers, which would include children as well as some adults, should yield themselves to another to be guided by their reason and shaped by it (590c7–591a3).[32] The non-rational part of the soul has thus been made tame and disciplined through early education (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 443B8–10).[33]

Although the description of the non-rational part of the soul (τὸ ἄλογον) is general in this passage, the context indicates that Plutarch has the spirited part of the soul in mind. The well trained non-rational aspect in question is keenly concerned with holding fast to what is honorable out of a sense of shame (αἰσχύνῃ), avoiding unlawful deeds and desires that it should shrink back from out of fear (φόβῳ). These emotional responses are characteristic of the spirited part of the soul, which desires what is honorable and to assert one's self as worthy of honor in the eyes of others.[34] This also aligns well with the passage that Plutarch draws upon in Plato's *Republic*, where the "better" passions that are in league with reason constrain the worse in lieu of the law and reason's normal constraint of the worse, lawless desires (9, 571b3–c1). For when the individual falls asleep, as the tyrannical soul does in this passage, the *Republic* indicates that the rational part of the soul (τὸ λογιστικόν) no longer maintains a tight rein on the desires within the soul (9, 571c3–4). The better passions that help restraint lawless desires and are normally in league with reason (μετὰ λόγου, 9, 571b6) belong to the spirited part of the soul that is the natural ally to reason.

The beasts that have been trained well (καλῶς) also bear a resemblance to the noble

[32] See n. 45 in Chapter 2.
[33] See n. 46 below for the quotation. Cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 441a2–3.
[34] Cf. *Republic* 4, 439e1–3, 440b9–d3; 9, 581a9–b4. See also the following note.

(καλός) horse in the Myth of the Charioteer, which represents the non-rational spirited part of the soul, in other respects. The characteristics of the non-rational part of the soul described in [T64] belong to the well functioning spirited part of the soul: it is readily obedient (εὐπειθές) and adds strength and intensity to diligence (ἰσχὺν ἐμποιοῦντα τῇ προσοχῇ καὶ τόνον) in continuing along the path set by the rational part of the soul, opposing errant desires toward lawless and insolent behavior, just as we saw before in *On Moral Virtue*, where the spirited part of the soul provides strength and power to the rational part of the soul against the appetitive part of the soul when its desires run awry of our rational intention (τῷ λογισμῷ παρέχον ἰσχὺν ἐπὶ τοῦτο [τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, 442A7] καὶ δύναμιν, *On Moral Virtue* 442A8–9). The lawless desires, then, issue from the appetitive part, while the spirited part of the soul keeps course, guarding the path it has been set on by reason, providing strength and intensity as a sort of ally to reason.[35]

During dreams *external* influence has been removed: the laws and fear of censure from other individuals are no longer of immediate concern. In a passage parallel to [T64], where Plutarch also discusses and quotes *Republic* 9 on lawless desires in sleep, he again notes that indulgence in such licentious desires occurs in sleep when "[the soul of a such a person] flees from the opinions of others and the laws and is furthest from feeling fear and a sense of shame" (ἐν δὲ τοῖς ὕπνοις ἀποφυγοῦσα δόξας καὶ νόμους καὶ πορρωτάτω γενομένη τοῦ δεδιέναι τε καὶ αἰδεῖσθαι, *On Virtue and Vice* 101A3–6).[36] Fear of external reproach and a sense of shame before others, which are desires characteristic of the spirited part of the soul, are internal psychological motivating factors that keep such licentious desires restrained in waking life. We fear consequences to our actions, in terms of punishment or diminished reputation. In our

[35] See also §A.V. in the Appendix.
[36] See n. 31 above for more of this passage.

dreams, however, when the rational part is put to sleep and not operative in overseeing our desires, the spirited part of the soul operates out of a sense of shame that has been *internalized*. There is no external force regulating or judging one's desires. No one else is watching. There is no rational part of the soul active to quell errant passions or command the spirited part of the soul to constrain them. In these states, only errant desires and the spirited part of the soul are active, and the spirited part sees those desires as shameful and opposes them.

So, it would seem that the evaluation of errant desires as shameful and to-be-opposed must be a function of the non-rational spirited part of the soul. This activity, which takes place while reason is inactive, looks to be an instance of deploying an internalized evaluative standard, perhaps one stored up for later use, and making a judgment based on internalized standards. As with the example of the early education of spirited passions, I will discuss how the spirited part of the soul is able to internalize standards and use them below in §VII. For now, I present this as evidence that spirited emotions are cognitive, since they involve evaluative representational content, and that the spirited part of the soul can make evaluative judgments on its own. It may internalize standards it receives from reason, but it looks as though it *uses* these standards to make judgments on its own, apart from reason.

§III The Spirited Part of the Soul and Cognitive Emotions in Plato: A Synopsis

Now that we have seen *that* certain passions which belong to the spirited part of the soul serve a positive role in restraining errant passions, we turn in this section and in those that follow to an analysis of *how* the internal dynamics of the psyche allow for more cognitive emotions, such as shame, to respond to evaluations of actions and desires deemed inappropriate. Is the spirited part of the soul capable of *having* evaluative judgments about certain desires or actions apart from the rational part of the soul? Further, is the spirited part of the soul capable of *forming*

evaluative judgments, not just receiving and preserving them from the rational part of the soul, as we find in the definition of courage in Plato's *Republic* (4, 442b10–c2=[A14] in the Appendix[37])?

For the sake of space, I provide in this section a brief outline of the major points that can be gleaned from several Platonic dialogues as a background for Plutarch's development and adaptation of his own view on the evaluative capacities of the spirited part of the soul. I should note that there are numerous approaches of interpretation that have been applied to the discussion of the spirited part of the soul and its function in Plato's dialogues which address and raise many puzzles for Plato's considered or developing views.[38] It is not my purpose here to solve these

---

[37] "And I suppose that we call each individual courageous in virtue of this part of the soul, whenever his spirited part preserves through pleasures and pains the command given by reason on what one should shrink back from or not" (καὶ ἀνδρεῖον δὴ οἶμαι τούτῳ τῷ μέρει καλοῦμεν ἕνα ἕκαστον, ὅταν αὐτοῦ τὸ θυμοειδὲς διασῴζῃ διά τε λυπῶν καὶ ἡδονῶν τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων παραγγελθὲν δεινόν τε καὶ μή).

[38] The extent to which tripartite psychology indicates that the rational, spirited, and appetitive parts function as distinct *agent-like* parts is a topic of enduring contention. Moline 1978, Annas 1981, Irwin 1995, Bobonich 2002 and 2010a, Lorenz 2006 and 2012, Brown 2012, and Erginel (forthcoming), for instance consider the parts of the soul to be agent-like. (Bobonich (2002, pp. 259–67; 2010a *passim*), however, considers Plato's *later* views, taking Plato to develop and change his views on the soul's parts after the *Republic*, to be less agent-like, describing the role of the non-rational aspects of soul as "cognitively impoverished." Persisting descriptions of the soul as agent-like in the *Timaeus* are exaggerated according to Bobonich's developmentalist view (2002, pp. 295–8 and 316–31). For dissenting views see Shields 2001 and 2014, Moravcsik 2001, Dorter 2006, Kamtekar 2006, Stalley 2007, and Price 2009a. Stalley (2007, p. 73) wants to read the person or individual as the subject of the non-rational parts' desires and opposing forces in cases of psychic conflict. I take it that Erginel (forthcoming), p. 4, correctly criticizes Stalley's interpretation on the grounds that it does not do justice to the argument in *Republic* 4, in which the Principle of Opposites dictates that two opposing actions / states occurring at the same time, in the same respect, and in relation to the same thing require two subjects. See Lorenz 2006, p. 21, who likewise argues that, while it must be acknowledged that the descriptions of pushing, pulling, bidding, and forbidding, etc. in *Republic* 4 are metaphorical, the *distinctions* made between the parts of the soul are meant to be taken more literally. Plato intends for us to understand that there are distinct parts of the soul that serve as the subjects of opposing actions. Price (2009a, p. 10) argues that the unity of consciousness is impossible if the soul's parts are agent-like. Against Price's view see Brown 2012, p. 62, n. 25. Moravcsik (2001, p. 41) prefers to describe the parts of the soul more as agent-like *sources* of desire and forbiddance than as agent-like *subjects*, while Shields (2001 and 2014) prefers to describe the parts of the soul as motivational streams. Dorter (2006, p. 118) also thinks that the description of separate motivations within the soul may ultimately be more fluid than scholars have assumed: "In Book 6 Socrates will offer a description of our soul's striving that confirms these hints that the tripartite division of the soul can be reduced to something much more continuous." Kamtekar (2006, p. 200) considers the parts of the soul to be "likely falsehoods" used to support Plato's ethical psychology which "seems to have the status of possibly true, provisional, motivationally approved-of way for non-philosophers to understand themselves as they move toward philosophy." See also n. 44 of Chapter 2. If the parts are agent-like, another potential difficulty of infinite regress is raised for further subdivisions of parts with appetitive, rational, and spirited parts, often called the "homunculus problem." See n. 66 below. A further point of puzzlement and contention concerns how the different functions and characterizations of the spirited part of the soul fit together so as to belong to a single spirited part or aspect of the

puzzles in Plato's psychology. I only hope to set a background for Plutarch's own view, which draws upon different points in Plato's dialogues without assuming a developmentalist or unitarian view of Plato's dialogues.[39]

I discuss the following points in greater detail and with more argumentation in the appendix to this chapter (§A.I.–§A.V.). First, there is some ambiguity in Plato's *Republic* about how the spirited part of the soul reacts to representations of injustice and shame, such as whether these reactions are due to evaluations of the spirited part of the soul, the rational part of the soul, or the overall person whose soul is under discussion (§A.I.). The ambiguity arises in the expositional passages aimed at showing that the spirited part of the soul is a third part, distinct from the rational and appetitive parts, namely in the examples of Leontius, who has a spirited emotion opposed to his appetitive desire, and Odysseus, who quells his spirited anger through the use of his reason (*Republic* 4, 437b1–4, 440a6–b4, 441a2–3). Despite ambiguity concerning the evaluation of actions that lead to spirited anger, the spirited part of the soul nonetheless consistently is described as being *responsive* to certain types of information concerned with injustice, honor, and shame (*Republic* 4, 439e1–3, 440b9–d3).

Secondly, (§A.II.) while there are hints that the non-rational parts of the soul may have the ability to form their own evaluative beliefs in contrast with the rational part of the soul

---

soul. See Singpurwalla 2010, pp. 883–4, and 2013, pp. 41–2 with notes, for a succinct summary of this issue. Penner 1971 argues that the spirited element is not a unified psychological element but exhibits characteristics of both the rational and appetitive parts of the soul in its different activities. Gosling 1973, Kamtekar 1998, and Brennan 2012 argue that the external enculturation of shame and honor culture becomes internalized within the soul, and the ultimate unifying characteristic of the spirited part is the desire to maintain and promote self-worth in competition and in terms of not violating social standards and one's own standards of good conduct. Cf. also Annas 1981, pp. 128–8, and Cooper 1999b, who also seem to hold this view.

[39] Plutarch does not appear to hold to a developmentalist view. Note, however, that if we do take a developmentalist view, then the more permissive extension of belief to the non-rational parts of the soul of *Republic* 10 seems to be denied in dialogues that follow the *Republic* before being reasserted in Plato's last dialogue, the *Laws*, where the passionate parts of the soul retain beliefs and are educated before reason is operative in children (1, 631d6–632a2, 643c1–644a2, 647a4–b7; 2, 653a5–c8, 654c3–d3).

(*Republic* 10, 602e4–603a8), in a number of Plato's other works (§A.III.) belief-formation requires rational capacities that do not belong to the non-rational parts of the soul (*Sophist*, *Theaetetus*, *Timaeus*, and *Philebus*). Belief-formation seems to require rational thought (διάνοια), and access to the content of belief seems to require understanding of propositional statements, which are activities and capacities limited to the rational part of the soul. Further, although there are hints in the *Timaeus* that the non-rational parts of the soul may have an intimate connection to sense-perception and sense-perceptible content, where the gods are described as having mixed the non-rational passionate parts of the soul with sense-perception (αἰσθήσει… συγκερασάμενοι ταῦτα [τὰ πάθη], 69c8–d6; cf. 77b1–6), the *Philebus* explicitly describes belief-formation as a rational process that occurs before sense-perceptible information reaches the non-rational parts of the soul (§A.IV.). Passages in both the *Timaeus* and *Philebus* seem to indicate that information gathered through the senses goes through the rational part of the soul first. It must be structured and translated by the rational part of the soul into formats to which the non-rational parts are capable of responding. Information flow seems to be "top-down," from the rational part of the soul to the lower, non-rational parts of the soul.[40]

[40] For the full argument see §A.III.–§A.IV. In the *Philebus*'s account of sense-perception and belief-formation, a scribe within the soul (γραμματεύς) writes propositional statements (γράφειν ἡμῶν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς…λόγους, 39a3) as beliefs are formed. In the *Timaeus*, the appetitive part of the soul cannot understand propositional statements but is instead led by images and phantoms (ὑπὸ δὲ εἰδώλων καὶ φαντασμάτων…μάλιστα ψυχαγωγήσοιτο, 71a3–7). Hence, the propositional statements that are formed in the intellect (the rational part of the soul) are reflected as images through the liver in the *Timaeus* so that information can be passed down to the appetitive part and affect it (71b3–c4), i.e. the information is translated into a more rudimentary form to which the lower part of the soul can respond. Likewise, in the *Philebus* the propositional statements formed by the inner scribe (γραμματεύς) are depicted as images by an inner painter (ζωγράφος) who passes this information to the appetitive part of the soul (39b6–7). The overall view that emerges for the information flow from sense-perception to the appetitive part of the soul is top-down insofar as information and belief contents are first formulated as propositional statements *before* being depicted in a format (images) to which the appetitive part of the soul is responsive. For the spirited part of the soul, the *Philebus* account similarly indicates that information is first formulated by the rational part of the soul before it is communicated to the spirited part. There seems to be no direct connection between sense-perceptible information and the non-rational parts of the soul if information must be processed and formulated as statements before communicated to the lower parts of the soul. For Bobonich (2002, pp. 259–67, 295–8, 316–31, and 343–5; 2010a), the lower parts of the soul, both the spirited and appetitive passionate parts suffer from "cognitive impoverishment" in Plato's later dialogues. They lack the capacity to form representations and their

Finally, (§A.V.) there are hints that the spirited part of the soul may have a capacity to apply different beliefs it receives from the rational part of the soul and a capacity to evaluate desires in the absence of rational influence (*Republic* 9, 571b3–d1; *Laws* 1, 631d6–632a2, 643c1–644a2, 647a4–b7; 2, 653a5–c8, 654c3–d3). These notions, as I mentioned in the previous section, Plutarch himself draws upon. If this is true, then these points seem to contradict the view that *all* evaluative beliefs are formed by the rational part of the soul. So, the top-down view of the *Philebus* and *Timaeus* may not be explanatory for *all* belief-formation and representational content.[41]

Given this last evidence, it is not apparent that Plato's dialogues present a single, fleshed-out, and consistent view on the non-rational spirited part of the soul's capacity to form evaluative beliefs. Nor do I need to come to a definitive answer on how information moves from sense-perception to the non-rational parts of the soul or the extent to which non-rational parts of the soul can form or have evaluative beliefs with complex content in Plato's psychology overall or as part of a developing or considered view. This brief synopsis and the analysis of the appendix to this chapter serve to set the stage for Plutarch's view of the cognitive capacities of the spirited part of the soul. Taking stock of these points in Plato's moral psychology, both the overall top-down view and hints that paint a picture opposed to the top-down view, we find that Plutarch's adoption of Platonic psychology is an adaptation, highlighting certain features over others. As we will see below, Aristotle plays a significant role in this adaptation.

---

contribution to emotions with cognitive content should be understood as non-conceptual affective states. Full-blown emotions with cognitive content are dependent on the resources and capacities for representation and conceptual content provided by the rational part of the soul. Spirited emotions in particular are dependent on the conceptual resources of reason (pp. 343–5). As Kamtekar 2010, p. 133, points out, in Bobonich's interpretation, the non-rational parts of the soul are reason-dependent for content and for action, since the non-conceptualized, non-representational affective states of the non-rational parts alone would be ineffective in producing action.

[41] Kamtekar (2010, p. 137) makes this point against the top-down view, as expressed by Bobonich 2002. See the previous note.

§IV Non-Rational Passions are Not Wholly Non-Rational

In §II above, I already noted that we have good evidence in Plutarch's works that the non-rational spirited part of the soul has a capacity to evaluate actions and internal psychological states independently of the rational part of the soul. In dreams when the rational part of the soul is inactive and in early education before the rational part of the soul is developed, our spirited emotions are able to evaluate desires and actions. Plutarch elsewhere writes that these cognitive emotions are not identical with rational judgments:

[T65] εἰ γὰρ τὸ πάθος ἦν κρίσις, ἔδει τῇ τοῦ φιλεῖν χρῆναι καὶ μισεῖν κρίσει τὸ φιλεῖν ἕπεσθαι καὶ τὸ μισεῖν· νυνὶ δὲ συμβαίνει τἀναντία, ταῖς μὲν προστιθεμένου τοῦ πάθους κρίσεσι ταῖς δ' ἀπειθοῦντος.

> For if passion were judgment, loving and hating would necessarily follow a judgment of what we ought to love or hate. But contrary results occur: passion adds force to some judgments while opposing others. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 449B11–C3).

That emotions such as hate can disagree and conflict with our judgments is sufficient evidence to establish that cognitive emotions are not identical with *rational* judgments. Throughout this section, Plutarch argues that emotions are separate from reason and that the passionate parts of the soul are different from the rational part. These differences are established by the Principle of Opposites in Plato's *Republic* 4, and Plutarch gives several examples in which we perceive the force of our passions at variance with our rational judgments (*On Moral Virtue* 448B3–9).

Before we can address how the spirited part of the soul is able to make evaluative judgments apart from reason, we first must address how the non-rational parts of the soul, both the spirited and appetitive parts, are responsive to reason and rational judgments, considering their status as *non-rational* parts of the soul. As we will see in this section, Plutarch argues that both of the non-rational passionate parts of the soul are non-rational, but they are not *wholly* non-rational (οὐκ παντελῶς ἄλογόν). To understand what this means, we will turn in the next

section to Aristotle's argument that the non-rational passionate part of the soul participates in some way in reason which allows it to listen to the dictates of reason and obey them (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13). Plutarch takes this position as well, as we will see in *Platonic Questions* 9, but he argues there that we can make further distinctions beyond whether the non-rational parts of the soul can listen to reason or are wholly non-rational. The spirited part of the soul, we will see, has a greater capacity to listen to reason than the appetitive part of the soul.

Let us begin with the first distinction between non-rational and wholly non-rational capacities. Taking Aristotelian psychology as generally consistent with Platonic psychology,[42] Plutarch argues that the non-rational *passionate* parts of the soul, i.e. the spirited (τὸ θυμοειδές) and appetitive (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν) parts of the soul, are not entirely void of reason unlike lower, or the lowest, parts associated with nutrition / vegetation (τὸ θρεπτικὸν καὶ φυτικόν) and sense-perception (τὸ αἰσθητικόν):

[T66] ταύταις ἐχρήσατο ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ἐπὶ πλέον Ἀριστοτέλης, ὡς δῆλόν ἐστιν ἐξ ὧν ἔγραψεν· ὕστερον δὲ τὸ μὲν θυμοειδὲς τῷ ἐπιθυμητικῷ προσένειμεν, ὡς ἐπιθυμίαν τινὰ τὸν θυμὸν ὄντα καὶ ὄρεξιν ἀντιλυπήσεως, τῷ μέντοι παθητικῷ καὶ ἀλόγῳ μέχρι παντὸς ὡς διαφέροντι τοῦ λογιστικοῦ χρώμενος διετέλεσεν, οὐχ ὅτι παντελῶς ἄλογόν ἐστιν ὥσπερ τὸ αἰσθητικὸν ἢ τὸ θρεπτικὸν καὶ φυτικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς μέρος· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὅλως ἀνήκοα λόγου καὶ κωφὰ τρόπον τινὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐκβεβλάστηκε καὶ περὶ τὸ σῶμα παντελῶς καταπέφυκε, τὸ δὲ παθητικὸν οἰκείου λόγου στέρεται καὶ ἄμοιρόν ἐστιν, ἄλλως δὲ τοῦ λογιζομένου καὶ φρονοῦντος εἰσακούειν καὶ τρέπεσθαι πρὸς ἐκεῖνο καὶ ὑπείκειν καὶ κατασχηματίζεσθαι πέφυκεν, ἐὰν μὴ τέλεον ᾖ διεφθαρμένον ὑφ' ἡδονῆς ἀμαθοῦς καὶ ἀκολάστου διαίτης.

Aristotle used these principles [that differentiate the parts of the soul in Plato's works] for a long time,[43] as is evident from what he [Aristotle] wrote, but later he attributed the

[42] For Plutarch's view of Aristotle's philosophy and psychology as generally compatible with Plato's and as part of the Platonic tradition see §IV–§V.a. of the Introduction and §VII of Chapter 2.

[43] Babut 1969b, pp. 137–40, assumes that Plutarch understood Aristotle as having a tripartite Platonic phase in his psychology, though he later conflated (in Plutarch's view) the spirited part of the soul with the appetitive part of the soul in *On the Soul* 1.1, 403a30, making the soul bipartite between a rational and non-rational part. On this point, Sandbach 1982, pp. 212–19, argues that in *Nicomachean Ethics* 7.6, 1149b1–2, where spirit follows reason, but desire does not (ὁ μὲν θυμὸς ἀκολουθεῖ τῷ λόγῳ πως, ἡ δ' ἐπιθυμία οὔ), and in *Politics* 7.15, 1334b21–5, Aristotle continued to abide by Platonic tripartition of the soul. *Contra* Sandbach, Vander Waerdt (1985a, p. 379–80, n. 23) convincingly argues that passages such as *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1102b30, once properly understood, do

> spirited part to the appetive part of the soul, since anger is a kind of appetite and desire for causing pain in return [Aristotle, *On the Soul* 1.1, 403a30]. Nevertheless, he continued through and through to treat the passionate and non-rational part of the soul as different from the rational part of the soul, not because it is wholly without reason, like the sense-perceptive part of the soul or the part of the soul responsible for nutrition and growth, which are wholly incapable of listening to reason, deaf, and in a way sprout from the body and are naturally concerned in their entirety with the body. The affective part of the soul lacks its own reason and does not have a share in it, but otherwise naturally takes heed of the rational and thinking part of the soul, turns toward it, submits to it, and conforms to it, if it has not been completely corrupted by witless pleasure and an indulgent lifestyle. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 442B4–C5)

With the exception of Aristotle's conflation of the spirited part with the appetitive part of the soul, Plutarch takes Aristotle's psychology to be, on the whole, consistent with Platonic psychology.[44] Plutarch affirms that Aristotle is right and consistent throughout his works in differentiating the rational and non-rational aspects of the soul. He also adopts Aristotle's additions of vegetative and sense-perceptive parts of the soul.[45] Here, he likewise attributes to the non-rational passionate parts of the soul an ability to listen to reason and obey it, which is

---

not lend support to a tripartite interpretation of Aristotle's psychology. Even in *Politics* 7.15, 1334b17–19, the division that Aristotle outlines is bipartite: "Then, just as the soul and the body are two, so even we see two parts of the soul, the non-rational and the part that has reason" (ἔπειτα ὥσπερ ψυχὴ καὶ σῶμα δύ' ἐστίν, οὕτω καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ὁρῶμεν δύο μέρη, τό τε ἄλογον καὶ τὸ λόγον ἔχον). Aristotle often speaks of the soul as composed of parts, but rejects soul-partition in favor of a view that the soul has several distinct *capacities* in *On the Soul* 3.9. On Plutarch's access to Aristotelian texts see §IV of the Introduction, esp. nn. 44–5.

[44] Cf. Opsomer (1998, pp. 33–6; 2006, p. 213; and 2012, p. 316–23), who argues that Plutarch is right to treat Aristotelian bipartite psychology as compatible with Platonic tripartite psychology. See also §V.a. in the Introduction with the accompanying notes.

[45] See *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 429E7–9: "For [nature] distributed to us five senses and five parts of soul, the nutritive, sense-perceptive, appetitive, spirited, and rational" (ἔνειμε γὰρ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς αἰσθήσεις πέντε καὶ μέρη ψυχῆς, φυτικὸν αἰσθητικὸν ἐπιθυμητικὸν θυμοειδὲς λογιστικόν). See also *On the E at Delphi* 390E9–F5. Cf. Opsomer 2012, pp. 323–4 and n. 68. In Opsomer's view, the further division of the soul into an additional vegetative and sense-perceptive part should not be taken to be Plutarch's considered view, since the speaker in both of the instances given above is listing as many natural groups of five as come to mind. *Contra* Opsomer, Plutarch attributes a nutritive / vegetative part of the soul to both plants and humans not only when he is listing off different entities that consist of five parts, but also when drawing on Plato's dialogues (*Causes of Natural Phenomena* 1, 911C1–D4). Plutarch draws upon *Republic* 6, 491d; 8, 564a and *Timaeus* 90a, which imply rather than explicitly state this view, as Sandbach notes in the Loeb edition of *Causes of Natural Phenomena*. Nevertheless, Plutarch can point to Socrates' caveat that there may be more parts of the soul "between" the rational, spirited, and appetitive (εἰ ἄλλα ἄττα μεταξὺ τυγχάνει ὄντα, *Republic* 4, 443d7–e1). They are not "between" the other three parts of the soul for Plutarch; they are *below* them. Plutarch thus finds evidence for the lowest parts of the soul in Plato's dialogues, but he draws on Aristotle in his interpretation of Platonic psychology to make their place in the soul explicit.

enough for the non-rational passionate parts of the soul to qualify as not entirely non-rational (οὐκ παντελῶς ἄλογόν).[46]

Plutarch's view in this passage draws upon several key points in *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13. In that chapter, Aristotle writes that the non-rational part (τὸ ἄλογον) is able to listen to and obey reason (κατήκοον καὶ πειθαρχικόν, 1103b21). Because this part of the soul is capable of listening, being persuaded in some manner, and obeying, we should say that it has reason (ἔχειν λόγον), though not in the strict sense of having reason and having it in itself (κυρίως καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ, 1102b30–1103a3). The vegetative part of the soul, however, has no share in reason whatsoever (τὸ φυτικὸν οὐδαμῶς κοινωνεῖ λόγου, 1102b29–30). So far, Plutarch's position, given above, is in line with Aristotle's view.

Plutarch, however, writes that the sense-perceptive part of the soul is completely void of reason, which is something Aristotle elsewhere denies (*On the Soul* 3.9, 432a30–1).[47] Here Plutarch echoes a description in Plato's *Timaeus* of non-rational perception (ἄλογος αἴσθησις, 69d4),[48] but he appears to describe an Epicurean view, which Plutarch addresses in *Reply to Colotes*.[49] If our sense-perceptions are unadulterated, striking us directly without an intermediate

[46] Cf. Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 443B8–10: "The part with which we experience spirited passion within ourselves and appetitive passions as well as pleasure and pain naturally hearkens to the thinking part and allows itself to be conformed by it" (τὸ θυμούμενον ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦν καὶ λυπούμενον καὶ ἡδόμενον ὑπακούειν τε τῷ φρονοῦντι καὶ πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ συνδιατίθεσθαι πέφυκεν). Though Plutarch does not write it here, he elsewhere indicates that both the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul *participate* in reason (λόγου μέτεστιν) to different degrees (*Platonic Questions* 9, 1008C11–D6=[T71] below), which seems to speak against taking the statement that the non-rational part of the soul has no share in reason (λόγου ἄμοιρος) as meaning that each can in no way participate in reason, which I discuss further in the next section.
Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1102b11–12; *On the Soul* 1.4, 409a9–10; 1.5, 411b27–8; 2.2, 413a25–b1; 2.3, 424b32–415a3; 3.12, 434a26. Cf. also Caston 2006, p. 317 and n. 3.

[47] "The sense-perceptive, which one could not easily establish as either non-rational or as having reason…" (τὸ αἰσθητικόν, ὃ οὔτε ὡς ἄλογον οὔτε ὡς λόγον ἔχον θείη ἄν τις ῥᾳδίως…).

[48] See [A17] in the Appendix. Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 77b1–6.

[49] Cf. D.L. 10.31 and S.E. *Against the Professors* 7.210. See nn. 51–2 below.

interpretation or distortion through some psychic faculty,[50] they nevertheless are not inerrant indicators of truth about the world around us (*Reply to Colotes* 1118B1–10).[51] The oar can appear bent in water and the tower round, but it could be the case that neither is as it appears to us (*Reply to Colotes* 1121A1–E7).[52]

If perceptions can be true or false, such as when the tower looks round but is not, then sense-perceptions seem to be cognitive, which would be an odd thing to think in conjunction with Plutarch's assertion that sense-perception is wholly non-rational. Add to this what appears to be an argument that sense-perception depends on reason for its function. In *On the Cleverness of Animals*, Plutarch's interlocutor, Autoboulos, who may be the *persona* of Plutarch's father, gives the following argument:

[T67] καίτοι Στράτωνός γε τοῦ φυσικοῦ λόγος ἐστὶν ἀποδεικνύων ὡς οὐδ' αἰσθάνεσθαι τὸ παράπαν ἄνευ τοῦ νοεῖν ὑπάρχει· καὶ γὰρ γράμματα πολλάκις ἐπιπορευομένους τῇ ὄψει καὶ λόγοι προσπίπτοντες τῇ ἀκοῇ διαλανθάνουσιν ἡμᾶς καὶ διαφεύγουσι πρὸς ἑτέροις τὸν νοῦν ἔχοντας· εἶτ' αὖθις ἐπανῆλθε καὶ μεταθεῖ καὶ διώκει τῶν προϊεμένων ἕκαστον ἀναλεγόμενος· ᾗ καὶ λέλεκται "νοῦς ὁρᾷ καὶ νοῦς ἀκούει, τἄλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά", ὡς τοῦ περὶ τὰ ὄμματα καὶ ὦτα πάθους, ἂν

[50] Cf. Plutarch, *Pericles* 1.2, quoted in n. 58 below; *On the Sign of Socrates* 588E4–6: "For, whenever we talk with each other, sound is like an impact, with the soul receiving the speech through the ears by force" (πληγῇ γὰρ ἡ φωνὴ προσέοικε τῆς ψυχῆς δι' ὥτων βίᾳ τὸν λόγον εἰσδεχομένης, ὅταν ἀλλήλοις ἐντυγχάνωμεν).

[51] "But to perceive appearances and to receive impressions from them is a common experience since it is accomplished by causes that are *not rational*. The argument that introduces sense-perceptions as inaccurate and unstable for conviction does not do away with the fact that each of these matters appears to us, but rather does not grant to those who use sense-perceptions according to appearance for practical ends the belief in those perceptions as entirely true and infallible. For what is necessary and useful from them is sufficient, since there is nothing else better, but they do not have the knowledge and understanding about each thing for which the philosophical soul longs" (τὸ δ' αἰσθάνεσθαι καὶ τυποῦσθαι πρὸς τὰ φαινόμενα κοινόν ἐστι πάθος <u>ἀλόγοις</u> περαινόμενον αἰτίαις. ὁ δὲ τὰς αἰσθήσεις λόγος ἐπαγόμενος ὡς οὐκ ἀκριβεῖς οὐδ' ἀσφαλεῖς πρὸς πίστιν οὔσας οὐκ ἀναιρεῖ τὸ φαίνεσθαι τῶν πραγμάτων ἡμῖν ἕκαστον, ἀλλὰ χρωμένοις κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπὶ τὰς πράξεις ταῖς αἰσθήσεσι τὸ πιστεύειν ὡς ἀληθέσι πάντῃ καὶ ἀδιαπτώτοις οὐ δίδωσιν αὐταῖς· τὸ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον ἀρκεῖ καὶ χρειῶδες ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι βέλτιον ἕτερον οὐκ ἔστιν· ἣν δὲ ποθεῖ φιλόσοφος ψυχὴ λαβεῖν ἐπιστήμην περὶ ἑκάστου καὶ γνῶσιν, οὐκ ἔχουσι).

[52] Plutarch criticizes the Epicurean view that all perceptions are true, since, he argues, it limits them to making sure statements about the experience of their perceptions but not the objects perceived. All perceptions could be true in virtue of the fact that we actually have these experiences the way that we do, but that does not tell us about the external world on which our perceptions report. Cf. Kechagia 2011, pp. 261–89. On the bent oar and round tower examples cf. S.E. *Against the Professors* 7.208–9; Lucretius 4.353–63 and 4.438–42.

The Stoics separate off the act of *assenting* to appearances, which involves commitment to a belief. See LS 40, 41A(=Cicero, *Academica* 2.145=*SVF* 1.66), 53S(=Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1057A=*SVF* 3.177), and esp. 69G–K. See nn. 94 and 96 below.

μὴ παρῇ τὸ φρονοῦν, αἴσθησιν οὐ ποιοῦντος.

> And indeed, there is an argument of Strato the natural philosopher that proves that it is absolutely impossible for there to be sense-perception without thinking, for, often the words when we are going over letters strike our eyes or our ears and escape us and elude us when we are paying attention to other things. Then, our attention returns and pursues and hunts after each of the things that passed it by as it reads back through them, for which reason it has been said 'intellect sees and intellect hears, everything else is deaf and blind,' [Strato fr. 112 Wehrli][53] since what happens to the eyes and ears does not produce perception unless the thinking part of the soul is present.
>
> (Plutarch, *On the Cleverness of Animals* 961A2–11)

Prima facie it appears that Autoboulos, *via* Strato, establishes that intellect (νοῦς) or the thinking part of the soul (τὸ φρονοῦν) is integral to the function of sense-perception. That is not quite what Autoboulos argues, however, as the surrounding context indicates. What Autobolous argues is that sense-perception serves no purpose unless there is some mental faculty that is able to understand the information it provides and then *use* it:

[T68] ἡ γὰρ φύσις, ἣν ἕνεκά του καὶ πρός τι πάντα ποιεῖν ὀρθῶς λέγουσιν, οὐκ ἐπὶ ψιλῷ τῷ πάσχον τι αἰσθάνεσθαι τὸ ζῷον αἰσθητικὸν ἐποίησεν.

> For nature, which they correctly assert produces everything for the sake of something and for some purpose, did not produce the animal faculty of sense-perception just for it to have a passive experience of something.
>
> (Plutarch, *On the Cleverness of Animals* 960E1–3)

Sense-perception is present in animals, the argument goes, so that its information can be used to avoid dangers and pursue what is beneficial to these animals (960E3–F5). Only rational capacities of the soul can use this information (960E7–F5 and [T67]). So, animals must have these rational capacities. If animals were merely capable of passively receiving information and feeling pain but unable to react to or use this information, it would be cruel and

[T69] αἰσθήσεώς τε πάσης καὶ φαντασίας τὸ χρώμενον οὐκ ἐχούσης ἀπηλλάχθαι βέλτιον ἢ πονεῖν καὶ λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀλγεῖν, ᾧ διακρούσεται ταῦτα μὴ παρόντος.

[53] Plutarch attributes this quotation to Epicharmus in *On the Great Fortune or Virtue of Alexander* 336B4–5.

> it would be better for for animals to be deprived of all sense-perception and representation that is not accompanied by a capacity to use that sense-perception and representation than for the animal to struggle, feel pain, and suffer, without a capacity present by which it could avoid these things.
>
> (Plutarch, *On the Cleverness of Animals* 960F5–961A2)

The quotation from Strato, then, is used in support of a teleological argument that sense-perception serves no purpose unless its information can be used by rational processes that guide the actions of an animal,[54] but the argument does not show that sense-perception as a faculty requires intellect or reasoning in its own function, a point that Autoboulos concedes (961B5–6).[55] It only requires that animals have the ability to use sense-perceptive information.

In this argument, Autoboulos denies the notion that animals might very well be capable of avoiding dangers and seeking what is beneficial through the use of less rational capacities of descrimination and representation.[56] Just after this argument, however, he grants that many of these abilities might be possible without intellect and reason through sense-perception and representation alone (961B5–8).[57] In *On Moral Virtue*, Plutarch writes that animals' defensive actions, avoidance of dangers, and activities in general could be explained by the affections that are closely tied to animals' bodies rather than by rational beliefs (450F6–451A7). Nevertheless, Autoboulos argues, even if we grant that discrimination of this sort can occur apart from higher

---

[54] Cf. Plutarch, *On the Cleverness of Animals* 960E7–F1: "The grasping and pursuing that follows the perception of things beneficial and the pushing away and avoidance of things destructive and painful is impossible for creatures not naturally capable of reasoning, judging, remembering, or attending to something" (τὰς δ' ἑπομένας τῇ αἰσθήσει τῶν μὲν ὠφελίμων λήψεις καὶ διώξεις, διακρούσεις δὲ καὶ φυγὰς τῶν ὀλεθρίων καὶ λυπηρῶν οὐδεμία μηχανὴ ⟨παρεῖναι⟩ τοῖς μὴ λογίζεσθαί τι καὶ κρίνειν καὶ μνημονεύειν καὶ προσέχειν πεφυκόσιν, accepting the addition of παρεῖναι in Porphyry).

[55] "But let it be the case that sense-perception does not require intellect for its own function" (ἔστω δὲ μὴ δεῖσθαι τοῦ νοῦ τὴν αἴσθησιν πρὸς τὸ αὑτῆς ἔργον). As with Aristotle, we can consider sense-perception to be different from the faculty that uses the information it provides, such as the representational faculty of the soul. Aristotle says that the faculty of representation is something altogether different (*On the Soul* 3.9, 432a31–432b1). Cf. Caston 2011, p. 47.

[56] See, for example, Aristotle, *On the Soul* 3.3, 428a18–24; 3.9, 432a15–433a8; 3.10, 433a11–12; 3.11, 434a5–7. A representational capacity in animals, which is not identical with thought or other rational capacities, allows for discriminatory responses and the mental activities of animals that lead to their actions. Cf. Sorabji 1993, pp. 17–20, 35–40, 50–1, 54–7, and 64.

[57] See n. 73 below.

rational powers, how could an animal continue to discriminate between what is dangerous and beneficial *later*, after the perception of these objects ceases, unless it has some rational capacity to remember its previous experiences (*On the Cleverness of Animals* 961B7–10)? As we will see below in §VII, Plutarch provides an answer to this question that does not require the rational part of the soul. If animals have non-rational passionate parts of the soul that are similar to humans', which Autoboulos accepts (961D2–5), there is a sense in which animals can be habituated to respond in certain ways to types of representations, retaining certain orientations and representational capacities without using the rational part of the soul.[58]

What Plutarch means in claiming that the sense-perceptive part of the soul is wholly non-rational should not be understood in terms of whether it can relate information that is true or false or give information about the world that can be evaluated by reason. Instead, we should understand Plutarch's denial to concern whether the sense-perceptive part of the soul, like the vegetative / nutritive part, can obey or respond to the dictates of the rational part of the soul in certain ways that would qualify as rational. This, I take it, is what Plutarch means to deny to the sense-perceptive part of the soul and the vegetative / nutritive part. Consider that most of humankind cannot consciously control or influence their metabolic functions or the *qualia* they receive in sense-perception.[59] Our rational powers may receive information from our sense-

[58] In *On the Cleverness of Animals*, the interlocutors take it for granted that non-rational animals are rational and are endowed with many rational capacities, since this entire dialogue centers on a debate over whether sea or land animals are cleverer (960A3–B3). Nevertheless, Autoboulos and Soclarus canvass several arguments for the rationality of animals before the debate begins. One challenge, which I believe presents a strong case for animal rationality but is outside the scope of this chapter and my dissertation to explore, asks how animals can make preparations for the future, such as traps, lairs, and places of shelter, without some rational capacity that allows them to learn to do some of these tasks and also to have prospective representations, i.e. projected representations about future events (961B10–C3). Stoics deny that animals have memory (Seneca, *Letters* 124.16–24) or a sense of the future (Cicero, *On Duties* 1.11), though certain actions provide evidence that they do.

[59] Plutarch, *Pericles* 1.2: "For, perhaps it is necessary for sense-perception to observe everything that becomes apparent to it, whether useful or useless, since it receives what it chances upon in virtue of the experience of an impact" (τῇ μὲν γὰρ αἰσθήσει κατὰ πάθος τῆς πληγῆς ἀντιλαμβανομένῃ τῶν προστυγχανόντων ἴσως ἀνάγκη πᾶν τὸ φαινόμενον, ἄν τε χρήσιμον ἄν τ᾽ ἄχρηστον ᾖ, θεωρεῖν).

perceptive faculties, and we may become aware of certain nutritive functions of our bodies, but the flow of information between these non-rational aspects and reason seems to go in one direction only, toward our conscious experience. In normal human experience, we cannot control these parts of our nature consciously at whim.[60] Our passions, on the other hand, are far more responsive to our thoughts and are within our power to shape, oppose, or incite through rational control or influence.

§V Participating in Reason to Different Degrees

Now, in [T66], Plutarch writes that the non-rational part of the soul should not be thought to have its own reason (οἰκεῖος λόγος). This denial answers a question raised in the opening of the same work, namely,

[T70] πότερον οἰκείῳ λόγῳ κεκόσμηται τὸ δεδεγμένον μόριον αὐτὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἢ μετέσχηκεν ἀλλοτρίου.

> whether the [passionate] part of the soul that receives it [moral virtue] has been equipped with its own reason or has come to participate in reason that does not belong to itself.
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 440D4–9)

The non-rational part of the soul, taking both the spirited and appetitive parts together, does not have its own internal rational part by which it responds to the rational part of the soul.[61] This leaves open the second option of participating in reason in [T70], except that Plutarch also seems to deny it in [T66]: the non-rational part of the soul does not have a share in reason (λόγου ἄμοιρον). Is Plutarch denying the notion of participation here or does he mean something else?

[60] Wim Hof, who can consciously raise his body temperature in extreme conditions, may be an exception.
[61] Though I have not included it in the quotation here, Plutarch is speaking of the passionate part of the soul (440D2), which he later describes as the non-rational part in which moral virtue is produced (443C10–D1=[T36] in Chapter 2).

If we turn to Plutarch's *Platonic Questions* 9, it would seem that Plutarch cannot be denying that the non-rational parts of the soul participate in reason, unless he changes his mind between the two works:

[T71] ὥσπερ οὖν συνωρίδος οὐχ ὁ ἡνίοχός ἐστιν ἀρετῇ καὶ δυνάμει μέσος, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἵππων ὁ φαυλότερος μὲν τοῦ ἡνιόχου βελτίων δὲ τοῦ ὁμοζύγου, οὕτω τῆς ψυχῆς οὐ τῷ κρατοῦντι τὴν μέσην ἀπένειμε τάξιν, ἀλλ' ᾧ πάθους μὲν ἧττον ἢ τῷ ⟨τρίτῳ μᾶλλον δ' ἢ τῷ⟩ πρώτῳ, λόγου δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ τρίτῳ ⟨ἧττον δ' ἢ τῷ πρώτῳ⟩ μέτεστιν.[62]

> Therefore, just as in a chariot drawn by two horses, the charioteer is not in the middle in terms of virtue and power, but the horse that is inferior to the charioteer but superior to his yoke-mate [is in the middle], in like manner does he [Plato] assign the middle position of the soul not to the part that rules but to the part that has less participation in passion than the ⟨third part [the appetitive part], but more than the⟩ first part [the rational part], and has more participation in reason than the third part, ⟨but less then the first⟩.
>
> (Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008C11–D6)

In this passage, which follows [T63], Plutarch continues his exegesis of the Myth of the Charioteer in Plato's *Phaedrus* and his explanation of why the spirited part of the soul is the natural ally of the rational part of the soul. As we saw in §I, the higher status of the spirited part was granted to it due to its greater receptivity to commands and its greater obedience to reason. Here, its greater participation in reason than the appetive part coordinates with its greater receptivity to instructions from reason.[63]

The notion that listening indicates a form of participation in reason fits well with *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, which, again, Plutarch draws upon in [T66]. Aristotle writes that

[T72] τὸ μὲν γὰρ φυτικὸν οὐδαμῶς κοινωνεῖ λόγου,τὸ δ' ἐπιθυμητικὸν καὶ ὅλως ὀρεκτικὸν μετέχει πως, ᾗ κατήκοόν ἐστιν αὐτοῦ καὶ πειθαρχικόν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν φίλων φαμὲν ἔχειν λόγον.

> the vegetative part in no way has a share in reason, but the appetitive and desiderative part in general participates in it in some way insofar as it listens and is submissive to it, just as we say that one pays attention to one's father or friends.

[62] Accepting emendations by Wyttenbach, which are marked by angle brackets.
[63] Cf. Plutarch, *On Listening to Lectures*: The capacity to listen to reason is more rational than passionate in nature (ἔστι δὲ λογικωτέρα μᾶλλον ἢ παθητικωτέρα, 37F11–38B1).

(Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1102b29–32)

Aristotle qualifies his remarks: the non-rational part of the soul participates *in some way* (πως) in reason. The capacity due to this participation is limited to a certain receptivity and ability to obey reason, and we should not simply say that the non-rational part is rational or fully participates in reason. Shortly after this, Aristotle further remarks:

[T73] εἰ δὲ χρὴ καὶ τοῦτο φάναι λόγον ἔχειν, διττὸν ἔσται καὶ τὸ λόγον ἔχον, τὸ μὲν κυρίως καὶ ἐν αὑτῷ, τὸ δ' ὥσπερ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀκουστικόν τι.

> If we should say that this [the non-rational part] has reason, what has reason will be two in number, namely, one strictly so and in itself and another as something as though it is capable of listing to its father. (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1103a1–3)

Reception of commands is possible, but, as Aristotle asserts by contrast, he does not mean something more advanced, such as a reasoning in the sciences and mathematics (1102b33).[64]

Taking this context into consideration, namely, these passages of *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13 that lie in background to [T66] and the coordination of listening to reason and participating in reason in *Platonic Questions* 9, I take it that Plutarch is *not* denying that the non-rational parts of the soul participate in reason *in some way* in [T66]. First, even in [T66], the non-rational parts of the soul are said to listen to (εἰσακούειν) and submit to (ὑπείκειν) the rational part of the soul, capacities which, according to *Platonic Questions* 9 and *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, are due to the participation in reason by the non-rational parts of the soul. Plutarch attributes these capacites to the non-rational part of the soul *immediately after* writing that it has no share in reason. Secondly, participation in reason is the only other option given in the opening to *On Moral Virtue*: passions either participate in reason (μετέσχηκεν) or they are equipped with their

[64] See also Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics* 2.1, 1219b26–1220a4.

own reason (οἰκείῳ λόγῳ κεκόσμηται, 440D3–9=[T70]). They do not have their own reason. Therefore, participation in reason is the only other option left.

I suggest, then, that Plutarch's denial that the non-rational passionate parts of the soul have a share in reason should be understand in one of the two ways.[65] (1) Plutarch means for us to understand that the non-rational parts of the soul do not have their own internal rational part. The denial of having a share in reason (ἄμοιρον) would really mean not having reason as a part (τὸ μέρος / τό μόριον). In this interpretation, Plutarch would forestall an objection that concerns whether each part of the soul could be subdivided further into appetitive, rational, and perhaps spirited parts.[66]

Alternatively, (2) Plutarch may intend only that the non-rational passionate parts of the soul cannot be said to have reason in the strict sense and in itself (κυρίως καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ), as Aristotle writes (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1102b30–1103a3). On this reading, Plutarch emphasizes the distinction between the non-rational parts of the soul compared to the rational part of the soul. Taken this way, Plutarch's point would be, again, that passions are not identical to rational judgments (*On Moral Virtue* 449B11–C3=[T65]) and that the non-rational parts of the soul are non-identical to the rational part.

Now, in *Platonic Questions* 9, Plutarch indicates not only that both non-rational

---

[65] It is unclear whether the partitive genitive of ἄμοιρον is οἰκείου λόγου or λόγου. If Plutarch meant that the non-rational part of the soul does not have a share in its own reason (οἰκείου λόγου ἄμοιρον), which would make this statement part of the first denial: "The affective part of the soul lacks its own reason and does not have a share in [its own reason]" (τὸ παθητικὸν οἰκείου λόγου στέρεται καὶ ἄμοιρόν ἐστιν, 442C1–2), it would get us out of the problem of denying participation in reason to the non-rational part of the soul. That interpretation, however, seems untenable, since I cannot imagine what it would add to say that the non-rational part of the soul does not have a share in its own reason after establishing that it does not have its own reason.

[66] Plutarch would block the "homunculus problem" that some authors (Crombie 1962, Vol.1, p. 356; Cross and Woozley 1964, p. 124; and Moravcsik 2001, pp. 44–5) allege Plato's tripartite psychology cannot avoid. The homunculus problem considers each part of the soul in need of at least its own rational and appetitive parts in order to act as agents, like little persons within each person. If each part of the soul can have its own parts, there is fear that these smaller parts within each part of the soul may also require their own smaller parts to act as agents, which would lead to an infinite regress. For arguments against attributing the homunculus problem to Plato's tripartite psychology see Annas 1981, pp. 44–5; Moline 1981, p. 75; Bobonich 2002, pp. 222, 248; Erginel 2013, p. 204.

passionate parts of the soul participate in reason, but that they participate in it to different *degrees*. The distinction of emotions by degree finds precedence in Theophrastus,[67] but Aristotle, as Plutarch recognizes in [T66], does not differentiate the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul in *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13. Aristotle often treats the spirited part of the soul as though it were merely part of the appetitive, which is reflected in Aristotle's description of the non-rational passionate part of the soul as "the appetitive and desiderate part in general" (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν καὶ ὅλως ὀρεκτικόν, 1102b30).[68]

In distinguishing between the non-rational passionate parts of the soul, Plutarch adds, beyond Aristotle's discussion of participation in *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, that the spirited part of the soul has greater access to cognitive content than the appetitive part of the soul because it has access to a representation of what is noble:

[T74] καὶ καθάπερ ἐν γράμμασι τὰ ἡμίφωνα μέσα τῶν ἀφώνων ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν φωνηέντων τῷ πλέον ἐκείνων ἠχεῖν ἔλαττον δὲ τούτων, οὕτως ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ θυμοειδὲς οὐκ ἀκράτως παθητικόν ἐστιν ἀλλὰ φαντασίαν καλοῦ πολλάκις ἔχει μεμιγμένην ἀλόγῳ τῇ τῆς τιμωρίας ὀρέξει.

> And just as in the case of letters, the semi-vowels[69] are between the mute consonants and regular vowels, in that they sound more than the former but less than the latter, so in the case of the human soul, the spirited part is not purely affective but often has a representation of what is noble mixed with a non-rational desire for revenge.
>
> (Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008B10–C4)

The desires of the non-rational appetitive part of the soul lack this capacity to represent what is noble. In contrast with spirited emotions, Plutarch likens the limited capacity of appetitive desires to tentacles of an octopus that reach only so far as to obtain a morsel of food within reach:

---

[67] Cf. Theophrastus, *On Emotions* in Simplicius, *On Aristotle's Categories* 235.7–8. Cf. Fortenbaugh 2006, p. 96, though the passage is incorrectly cited as 253.7–8. Cf. also Fortenbaugh 2008.
[68] Cf. Fortenbaugh 1975, p. 35.
[69] According to LSJ, s.v. ἡμίφωνος, under the substantive ἡμίφωνον (2), ϱ and ς are semi-vowels. LSJ cites Aristotle, *Poetics* 1456b27; Philodemus, *On Poems* 2.16; among others.

[T75] οὐ γάρ τι φαῦλον ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ μικρὸν οὐδ' ἀγεννές ἐστιν οὐδ' ὥσπερ ⟨τὰς πλεκτάνας⟩ οἱ πολύποδες ἄχρι τῶν ἐδωδίμων ἐκτείνει τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ἀλλὰ ταύτην μὲν ὀξύτατος ἀποκόπτει κόρος ἀκαρὲς ὥρας μόριον ἀκμάσασαν, τῶν δὲ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ὁρμῶν καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ καλῷ τιμὴν καὶ χάριν "οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῶν μέτρον ὁ τοῦ βίου χρόνος", ἀλλὰ τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος ἐπιδραττόμενον τὸ φιλότιμον καὶ φιλάνθρωπον ἐξαμιλλᾶται ταῖς πράξεσι καὶ ταῖς χάρισιν ἡδονὰς ἀμηχάνους ἐχούσαις.[70]

For the soul is not something of little worth nor is it devoid of nobility, and it does not extend its desires like octopi, stretching their tentacles out so far as to obtain what is edible. Rather, satisfaction of a desire very swiftly brings such [an appetitive] desire to its end, which flourishes for a hair's breadth of an hour, while "the length of one's life is no measure for"[71] the impulses toward what is honorable and the esteem and favor due to honor. Instead, the love of honor and love for others, laying hold of all time, strives vehemently after actions and favors that hold indescribable pleasures.

(Plutarch, *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* 1098D11–E9)[72]

In the context of this passage, Plutarch criticizes the Epicureans for praising pleasures of the belly as the focal point of a blessed life, quoting Metrodorus in particular (1098C9–D7). Plutarch believes that the Epicurean view neglects the higher pleasures of public and social life (D7–11).

Contained within Plutarch's polemical criticism of the Epicurean view, however, is a point of particular interest in distinguishing the nature of appetitive desires and spirited desires. Appetites, like spirited desires, are *about* something and intentional insofar as they have objects toward which they stretch. The appetitive desire stretches out toward what can sate that desire, like an octopus' tentacle snatching at a morsel of food. The object is in some sense represented

[70] Accepting Einarson and DeLacy's emendation here marked by angle brackets. Pohlenz adds πλεκτάνας τῆς before ἐπιθυμίας and Döhner adds πλεκτάνας after ἐπιθυμίας.

[71] *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, Adespota fr. 1241 Kock.

[72] See also Sandbach fr. 118 from Plutarch's *Against Pleasure*=Stob. 3.6.51: "But the law for our pleasures [of appetite] is the same as the one even of non-rational animals, who do not have a desire for anything after remedying the appetites, but satiety for what urges them on since they are not compelled by pleasures" (ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερα νόμος ὁ καὶ τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων, οἷς μετὰ τὸ ἀκέσασθαι τὰς ἐπιθυμίας οὐδενὸς ὄρεξις, ἀλλὰ κόρος τῶν ἐπειγόντων ἀβιάστοις ἡδοναῖς). Reading καί for Jacobs' κατά in καὶ τῶν ἀλόγων; οἷς, added by Sandbach in οἷς μετὰ; and omitting ταῖς before τῶν ἐπειγόντων. Sandbach follows Wilamowitz (1923, p. 84) in denying the authenticity of this fragment based on hiatus and "nauseous affection of style." While the portion I quote here seems in line with *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* 1098D11–E9, the preceding sentence treats all pleasures not just as satiety of desires but like treatments of a disease (θεράπειαι). While at times Plutarch treats *inordinate* or *excessive* passions and desires as diseases, the view that even legitimate pleasures (δίκαιαι ἡδοναί) and desires are like diseases is not Plutarch's own view. See §VI of Chapter 2.

as an object of desire that is appropriate to one's nature (τὸ φανὲν οἰκεῖον), i.e. the appetitive part of the soul need not have an evaluative representation of food that is any more complex than as something that is the right type as to-be-pursued and to-be-eaten (φαντασία τοῦ οἰκείου, *Reply to Colotes* 1122C9–D1).[73] Once the object is obtained, the appetitive desire ceases.[74]

Here we find that Plutarch affirms that the non-rational passions are intentional with evaluative representational content. If the appetitive part of the soul did not have any capacity for an evaluative representation, it would not be able to motivate action, since it would not able to focus the direction of the affective energies of the passions.[75] This capacity also appears to belong to the non-rational appetitive part itself, which has some participation in reason, though less than the spirited part (*Platonic Questions* 9, 1008C11–D6=[T71]).

In contrast with the simple representations of appetitive desires, however, spirited emotions reach toward something far harder to grasp and endure for far longer, since they stretch

---

[73] In his defense of Academic withholding of assent, Plutarch writes: "Action needs two things, the representation of what is fitting and impulse toward what is apparently fitting, neither of which is in conflict with suspension [of belief and assent]" (ἡ γὰρ πρᾶξις δυοῖν δεῖται, φαντασίας τοῦ οἰκείου καὶ πρὸς τὸ φανὲν οἰκεῖον ὁρμῆς, ὧν οὐδέτερον τῇ ἐποχῇ μάχεται). Cf. *On the Cleverness of Animals* 961B7–8: Sense-perception can allow for an animal to distinguish between what is appropriate or alien to itself (τῷ ζῴῳ πρὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον καὶ τὸ ἀλλότριον ἡ αἴσθησις ἐνεργασαμένη διαφορὰν). The evaluative representation of something as fitting or appropriate need not be complex or count as a more rational state of belief involving assent. Cf. Moss 2012b, pp. 274–5, and Singpurwalla 2011, pp. 283–98, on the simple, evaluative content of appetitive desires in Plato's works. For Aristotle, emotion, which would describe both spirited and appetitive passions for Plutarch, and apprehension of things and activities as pleasant or painful, is a way of evaluating an apparent good (*On the Soul* 431a8–11); cf. Sherman 1997, p. 78.

[74] Greed for more possessions and wealth can be insatiable. Corrupt, insatiable desires such as greed, however, would not count as appetites. See Plutarch fr. 150, *Concerning Wealth*=Stob. 4.31.86. See also *On Virtue and Vice* 100F9–101B, quoted in n. 31 above.

[75] For this argument applied to Plato's psychology see Kamtekar 2010, p. 133: Undirected affective states, as Bobonich (2002, p. 259) understands passions to be in Plato's later works, would lack the capacity to be "goal-setting agents or the possessors of beliefs and desires." Every emotion, according to Bobonich's view, requires the rational part of the soul to represent objects and to provide direction to passions, which have no cognitive content of their own (see nn. 40–1 above). Cf. also Nussbaum 2001, pp. 24–33: Although Nussbaum does not attribute the "adversary's position" on emotions, which holds that they are energies without cognitive content, the position, which is sometimes attributed to Plato, would not be able to account for the evaluation of objects as fitting even for simple appetitive evaluations of objects, much less more complex spirited evaluations. Cf. also Ben-Ze'ev 1997.

out toward a more abstract and less concrete goal, namely, honor and glory.[76] The representation of what is noble (φαντασία καλοῦ), to which the spirited part of the soul has access and the appetitive part does not, is more complex in nature and more cognitively rich. First, spirited emotions of honor and shame involve the evaluation of desires and actions according to standards of what is sanctioned and forbidden, honorable and shameful. These standards are essential features of the representational content of cognitive emotions such as shame and honor, and used in the evaluation of actions, desires, and habits, either one's own or those that belong to, or are perceived to belong to, another person.[77] Unlike the general appetite for drink, as it is described in *Republic* 4 (437d7–438a6), or the tentacular notion of appetites in [T75], where the valence of a particular object is only in terms of its perceived ability to satisfy a particular appetite, the spirited emotions also evaluate desires and actions based on whether they conform to standards of honor and shame.[78]

Secondly, spirited emotions are more complex than those of the appetitive part of the soul because they involve the awareness of others as a feature of their representational content or a

---

[76] By "more abstract" I mean that a sense of honor requires more cognitive content and notions than the evaluation of objects as the right type to go after and that a standard of honor and notions of glory or ill-repute are not tangible or concrete; they exist as representations of mind. I do not mean to imply that the spirited part of the soul is capable of *abstracting* to ideas as part of its cognitive capacities, but that the spirited part of the soul has some greater grasp on what is honorable and appropriate by which it is able to judge actions and desires.

On abstraction, which Plutarch describes as a process by which we move from sense-perceptible objects to objects of thought and the Forms themselves see *Platonic Questions* 3, 1001E. Cf. Opsomer 2007b, p. 394 and Sierksma-Agteres 2015, p. 65, n. 32.

Aristotle holds a different view on the relationship between a representation of what is noble / appropriate (φαντασία καλοῦ) and spirited anger. He denies that spirited emotions aim at what is noble (καλόν) due to cognitive deficiency of emotions such as anger which we share with non-human animals (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1116b23–1117a9). Those who are valiant in battle, for instance, act on the passion of θυμός, not on account of what is noble (οὐ διὰ τὸ καλὸν…ἀλλὰ διὰ πάθος, 1117a8–9). A representation of what is noble for Aristotle requires the rational part of the soul in policy / choice (προαίρεσις) and rational desire (βούλησις, *Great Ethics* 1191a22–3). Cf. Irwin 2011, p. 247 on these points.

[77] This last qualification concerns the attribution of desires and intentions to others, to which we do not have direct access, but may believe to be of a certain kind and directed toward certain ends.

[78] I do not want to overstate the case, since, as Glaucon remarks in *Republic* 4, 438d, perhaps someone would have a point if they were to say that even appetitive desires were for hot, cold, or good drink, and not just drink. Nevertheless, Plutarch's example of tentacular desires seems to speak to very limited evaluations of desires in terms of perceived satisfaction.

representation of an ideal image for one's aspiration. There is some debate on whether the spirited emotions of anger, shame, and digust are so rooted in a shame-based culture centered on perceived self-worth, wherein one's social status is the central case by which all evaluations of what is honorable and shameful are made, that these emotions must always refer back to one's standing in society. What is shameful and honorable and other spirited emotions in this view all refer to one's perceived social standing in the eyes of outside observers, real or imagined.[79] Alternatively, some hold to the "ideal image" view of shame and honor at work in Plato's psychology of spirited emotions, where an ideal image of what it means to be honorable is the standard by which actions and desires are judged. This ideal image is taken to be a projection within the soul; the standards of evaluation are thought to be internalized, so that judgment need not require actual outside observers.[80] Plutarch's moral psychology incorporates both the external view and the internalized ideal image view, as we will see in the discussion of particular spirited emotions in the next section.

Before we move to specific examples, I would like to note that the spirited part of the

---

[79] Cf. Annas 1981, pp. 126–8; Taylor 1985, pp. 57–77; Cairns 1993, pp. 16–18; Cooper 1999b, pp. 132–4, 420–3; and Burnyeat 2006; Wilberding 2009; Brennan 2012. See also n. 83 below. Cairns (1993, p. 18), for instance, writes that shame seems to require an audience that passes judgment, whether or not that audience is imagined or real: "One can be one's own audience, provided one comes to take up the position of a detached observer *vis-à-vis* oneself." Taylor (1985, p. 67) believes that "[s]hame requires a sophisticated type of self-consciousness. A person feeling shame will exercise her capacity for self-awareness, and she will do so dramatically: from being just an actor absorbed in what she is doing she will suddenly become self-aware and critical. It is plainly a state of self-consciousness which centrally relies on the concept of another, for the thought of being seen as one might be seen by another is the catalyst for the emotion." Bobonich (2002, pp. 343–7) argues children feel an angry desire for retaliation at perceived harm, develop an evaluation of that harm as an affront to their sense of honor and status, grow to identify their own sense of honor with others they value, and then, if all goes well, begin to value their own soul as something to be honored through a recognition of what is fine and valuable. Burnyeat 2006 and Wilberding 2009 hold the view that societal standards inform spirited evaluations but are not internalized. Brennan 2012 takes societal standards of honor and shame to be the basis for all spirited emotions.

[80] Cf. Cairns 1993, pp. 387–8. Cf. also Gosling 1973, pp. 41–51; Kamtekar 1998, pp. 315–39; and Hobbs 2000, p. 30. Cf. also Singpurwalla 2013, who argues that the spirited part of the soul, in its desire for honor, seeks to live according to the rational standards of what is honorable according to the rational part of the soul, not just standards informed by societal expectations: spirit wants to live up to one's own rational expectations, and, if all goes well, to track what is discovered to be truly honorable in that pursuit. It ought not to internalize standards so much as to depend on reason.

soul's greater participation in reason helps shed light on why the spirited part of the soul is the ally of reason. The spirited part of the soul is able to understand the dictates of the rational part of the soul better. While appetitives focus on satisfaction almost exclusively, the spirited part of the soul can be induced to avoid or pursue certain actions based on whether the command it receives from the rational part of the soul concerns notions of honor or shame. The spirited part of the soul is sensitive to more information than the appetitive part of the soul, and therefore does not simply yield to reason; it is better able to be *persuaded* by reason.[81]

§VI Cognitive Emotions: The Desire for Honor, Shame, Anger, Hate, and Envy

Turning now to particular types of spirited emotions and their representational content, we will look at examples of complex representational content involved in spirited emotions. We begin with Plutarch's notion that the desire for honor and a sense of shame can incorporate an ideal image of what one desires to be, both in one's own eyes and in the eyes of others. I repeat here a quotation from Chapter 3. When one is rebuked, it

[T56] ζῆλον ἐμποιεῖ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν αἰδουμένῳ τὰ αἰσχρὰ τῇ τῶν καλῶν ὑπομνήσει καὶ παράδειγμα ποιουμένῳ τῶν βελτιόνων ἑαυτόν.

> produces rivalry against oneself, because one feels shame over one's disgraceful deeds by the memory of [one's past] noble deeds, and one considers onself [from the past] as a model of better deeds. (Plutarch, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 72D2–4).

In this example, Plutarch incorporates an ideal image of oneself, setting within one's mind the projection of one's better self from the past. This projected ideal may be based on reality or on an idealized view of one's own past self and actions. Against this ideal, current shameful actions

[81] It is interesting that Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, without making much of a point of it, focuses on what would be called spirited emotions in Plato's dialogues and Plutarch's works, which are sensitive to admonition, rebuke, and encouragement (νουθέτησις καὶ ἐπιτίμησις καὶ παράκλησις) as proof that the non-rational part of the soul participates in reason and is persuaded by it (1102b33–1103a1). He does make this distinction however, in *Nicomachean Ethics* 7.6, 1149b1–2, for which see n. 43 above. I discuss the difference between rational and non-rational persuasion in §I of Chapter 5.

and one's current state of character are compared. One then tries to change one's action and to reshape one's current self into the mold of that ideal.

The desire for honor that is present here is inward focused. One looks at oneself as though from an external perspective, taking on the role of an outside observer, but it really is a case of introspection into one's own actions and character.[82] What is considered honorable and shameful may have been shaped by society at large or one's own reflections, but the desire to be honorable is considered in terms of how one looks at oneself in the mirror of the soul, as it were, to see whether one's current image lives up to one's own aspirations to be a certain kind of person who acts a certain way.[83] The ideal we imagine for ourselves could be far different from the ideal set by society at large, or heavily modified from what we were taught earlier in life.[84]

In this example, we also see that the initial rebuke comes from another person. In this instance, it is a friend who speaks frankly about one's shortcomings (72B9–72D1). The rebuke draws upon standards of shameful and honorable actions and character that both the friend and the one rebuked ostensibly share. In the example that Plutarch provides, the friend intends to provoke a sense of shame by revealing himself as a disapproving observer, and the example

---

[82] Cf. Cairns 1993, p. 18, quoted in n. 79 above.

[83] Cf. Tracy and Robins 2007, pp. 5–9: Modern studies classify a sense of shame as a self-conscious emotion, which admits of complex representational content: "*Self-conscious emotions require self-awareness and self-representations*.…A sense of self…includes both an ongoing sense of self-awareness (the 'I' self) and the capacity for complex self-representations (the 'me' self, or the mental representations that constitute one's identity). Together, these self processes make it possible for self-evaluations, and therefore self-conscious emotions, to occur" (pp. 5–6). Emphasis is original. They continue, "by self-representations, we do not mean simply the cognitive contents of the personal self, but also relational, social, and collective self-representations.…To experience shame…an individual must have the capacity to form stable self-representations and to consciously self-reflect (i.e., direct attentional focus toward those representations)" (pp. 6–7).

[84] I turn to the formation of character in terms of inculcating beliefs about what is shameful and honorable below in §VII, but more fully in Chapter 5. Cf. Taylor 1985, pp. 76–7: "There is no reason to deny that shame in all its occurrences is a moral emotion, provided that morality is not thought of just in terms of adhering to or breaking certain moral rules, but is taken to include personal morality, a person's own view of how he ought to live and what he ought to be. The final self-directed adverse judgment in shame is always the same: that he is a lesser person than he should be, for in some way a better person would not find himself in a position where he can be seen as he is or may be seen."

described in [T56] sits among Plutarch's suggestions on ways to incite our friends to better themselves by drawing upon their sense of honor and shame (69E9–74E10).

Yet there is no indication here that another individual is required to begin the process of self-improvement. We could, presumably, compare our current selves and actions to those of the past and to a future ideal and be motivated by a sense of shame that our ideal has not been met. So, while the friend who points out one's faults may be someone whose respect we desire, it seems entirely possible that this form of shame and desire to become better could be effective without any outside observers rebuking us and without consideration of how we look to those around us, focusing solely on how well we abide by our own standards.[85]

Elsewhere, Plutarch goes into more detail on the affective experience of shame. If we are not thoroughly corrupted, we should feel painful bites (δηγμοί) and remorse (μεταμέλεια) over our faults. If we are exposed in our faults before others, we should feel an agitation of mind or dizziness (ἴλιγγος) and experience a great deal of sweat (ἱδρώς, *On Listening to Lectures* 46D4–13; *On Compliancy* 536C5–9).

Similar to the first example is Julius Caesar's desire for greater glory and reputation, which I also mentioned in §V of Chapter 3. Caesar's

[T76] τὸ μὲν πάθος οὐδὲν ἦν ἕτερον ἢ ζῆλος αὐτοῦ καθάπερ ἄλλου καὶ φιλονικία τις ὑπὲρ τῶν μελλόντων πρὸς τὰ πεπραγμένα.

> passion was nothing other than a rivalry with himself as though with another person, and [it was] a kind of competition for future actions compared to those already complete.
> (Plutarch, *Caesar* 58.4)

Here, the notion of imagined future actions is more explicit. So too is the comparison with oneself as though the projected self were another person (καθάπερ ἄλλου). This desire for

[85] Cf. Singpurwalla 2013 and nn. 80 and 84 above.

greater glory, however, does not involve retrospective shame or remorse. The image of his past self and past feats serve not as an ideal that Caesar desires to return to or match, but as *comparanda* to be surpassed in action and glory.

In examples of anger, Plutarch, focuses more on perceived slights than codes of conduct, but standards of what is honorable or shameful are no less part of the evaluation of actions that result in anger. In *On the Control of Anger*, the speaker Fundanus makes the following general observation:

[T77] ἀλλ' αὐτῆς γε τῆς ὀργῆς ἀναθεωρῶν τὴν γένεσιν ἄλλους ὑπ' ἄλλων αἰτιῶν ἐμπίπτοντας εἰς αὐτὴν ἑώρων, οἷς ἐπιεικῶς ἅπασι δόξα τοῦ καταφρονεῖσθαι καὶ ἀμελεῖσθαι παραγίνεται.

> But in observing the origin of anger itself, I noticed that different people are swept into anger due to different causes. But for nearly all of them there occurred a belief that they had been treated disdainfully and slighted. (Plutarch, *On the Control of Anger* 460D1–4)

While there are various reasons why particular people find this or that action to warrant the reaction of anger, the general structure remains the same. One has a belief (δόξα) that damage has been done to oneself and to one's reputation. One's sense of honor and self-worth are at stake.[86] As in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*,[87] Plutarch's examples of anger involve perceived slights as a

[86] Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.2, 1378b16–17: "For one shows contempt for as many things as one supposes not to be worth anything and slights those things as worth nothing" (ὅσα γὰρ οἴονται μηδενὸς ἄξια, τούτων καταφρονοῦσιν, τῶν δὲ μηδενὸς ἀξίων ὀλιγωροῦσιν). We believe that our sense of worth, our honor, is violated when we are treated as though we were of less value than we perceive ourselves to be.

[87] *Rhetoric* 2.2, 1378a30–1378b1: "Let anger be a desire involving pain for revenge because of what appears to be a slight against oneself or one's friends, because the slight was not fitting. If this is what anger is, then it must be the case that the angry person is always angry at some particular person, such as Kleon, but not against a human in general, and [it must be the case] that he did something to oneself or to one's friends or intended to do so" (ἔστω δὴ ὀργὴ ὄρεξις μετὰ λύπης τιμωρίας διὰ φαινομένην ὀλιγωρίαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἢ τῶν αὐτοῦ, τοῦ ὀλιγωρεῖν μὴ προσήκοντος. εἰ δὴ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἡ ὀργή, ἀνάγκη τὸν ὀργιζόμενον ὀργίζεσθαι ἀεὶ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστόν τινι, οἷον Κλέωνι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸν ἢ τῶν αὐτοῦ τί πεποίηκεν ἢ ἤμελλεν, I follow Jebb in omitting φαινομένης after τιμωρίας). See also *Rhetoric* 2.4, 1382a2–7: "Anger, spiteful treatment, and slander are causes of enmity. Therefore anger comes from slights against onself while enmity can occur even without slights against oneself, since we hate those whom we suppose to be of a particular sort. And anger always is concerned with particular individuals, as toward Callias or Socrates, but hate can also be against general classes, since everyone hates a thief or a sycophant" (ποιητικὰ δὲ ἔχθρας ὀργή, ἐπηρεασμός, διαβολή. ὀργὴ μὲν οὖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν πρὸς αὐτόν, ἔχθρα δὲ καὶ ἄνευ τοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν· ἂν γὰρ ὑπολαμβάνωμεν εἶναι τοιόνδε, μισοῦμεν. καὶ ἡ μὲν

central feature, but these slights must violate some code of conduct and cause unwarranted dishonor if anger is to be justified.[88] Standards of what is honorable and shameful, then, are in play in one's evaluations of actions that give rise to anger.[89]

Plutarch notes that emotions can be closely related in certain respects and differ by their representational content.[90] In making a distinction between the spirited emotions of envy and hate (*On Envy and Hate* 536F3–5), for example, Plutarch writes:

[T78] γεννᾶται τοίνυν τὸ μῖσος ἐκ φαντασίας τοῦ ὅτι πονηρὸς ἢ κοινῶς ἢ πρὸς αὐτόν ἐστιν ὁ μισούμενος (καὶ γὰρ ἀδικεῖσθαι δόξαντες αὐτοὶ πεφύκασι μισεῖν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλως ἀδικητικοὺς ἢ πονηροὺς προβάλλονται καὶ δυσχεραίνουσι)· φθονοῦσι δ' ἁπλῶς τοῖς εὖ πράττειν δοκοῦσιν. ὅθεν ἔοικεν ὁ μὲν φθόνος ἀόριστος[91] εἶναι, καθάπερ ὀφθαλμία πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ λαμπρὸν ἐκταρασσόμενος, τὸ δὲ μῖσος ὥρισται, καθ' ὑποκειμένων ἀεί τινων ἀπερειδόμενον προσώπων.[92]

ὀργὴ ἀεὶ περὶ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα, οἷον Καλλίᾳ ἢ Σωκράτει, τὸ δὲ μῖσος καὶ πρὸς τὰ γένη· τὸν γὰρ κλέπτην μισεῖ καὶ τὸν συκοφάντην ἅπας). Cf. also Aristotle, *Topics* 127b30–2.

[88] See *Rhetoric* 2.2, 1378a30–1378b1, quoted in the preceding note: The slight must be thought to be unjustified. See also *Nicomachean Ethics* 5.8, 1135b25–9. For Aristotle, rational reflection on the justification of anger cause its increase (see *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1102b25–1103a1; cf. Kraut 2012, p. 531). Cf. Harris 2001, p. 61; Konstan 2006, pp. 66–9 and 128. Cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 440c6–d3=[A16] in the Appendix. Cf. also Chrysippus' definition of anger as directed at injustice (Stob. 2.7.10c (p. 91, ll. 10–11)=*SVF* 3.395; D.L. 7.113; cf. Konstan 2006, p. 66 and n. 49).

On the justification of anger, Plutarch contrasts an irrational form of anger, which is directed at one's loved ones in error, from one that is justified against those who do wrong (δικαίως, *On Moral Virtue* 448D5–7). He later revisits the notion, calling the form of anger that aids and intensifies justice (ἡ δικαιοσύνη) righteous anger (μισοπονηρία, 451D9–E4=[T55] in Chapter 3). In *On Envy and Hate*, he writes that we praise righteous anger (μισοπονηρία) and that those whom we say deserve to be hated (ἀξιομισότητοι) are hated justly (δικαίως, 527C9–10, D3). If we believe that we have not been treated unjustly (πεισθέντες μηδὲν ἀδικεῖσθαι), these emotions cease (538C5–8). In *On the Control of Anger*, he writes that our anger is increased when we feel that injustice goes unpunished (460A10–B10). Cf. Ingenkamp 2000, pp. 263–4, and Van Hoof 2005, p. 502. See also Chapter 3, n. 56.

[89] Cf. Rozin, Lowery, and Imada 1999, who connect emotions of contempt, anger, and disgust (the CAD triad) as elicited by the violation of standards of conduct. While I do not think that Plutarch's standards are identical to those of Rozin, Lowery, and Imada, they share the same basic structure. For Rozin *et al*. and others who follow the CAD triad hypothesis, anger is a response to the violation of an individual's autonomy, which for Plutarch, Plato, and Aristotle, would include slights on one's social standing; contempt is a response to violations of conduct concerning one's community; and disgust is elicited by perceived violations made against what is considered sacrosanct.

[90] Several emotions often occur in close connection to each other in Plutarch's works. Anger, righteous anger, and justified hate for people of bad character are closely connected. See n. 88 above. Shame, remorse, and repentance often occur together, too (*On the Bravery of Women* 259B6–8; *Sayings of Kings and Emperors* 207D; *Can Vice Cause Unhappiness* 498C12–D8; *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 554A8–B4, 554D10–55; *On Tranquility of Mind* 476E11–477A6; *Marius* 29.11).

[91] Following the reading of ἀόριστος against MS HU[1], which has ὁ ἄριστος, since it fits with the contrast being made between bounded hate and unbounded envy.

[92] Following Kronenberg's conjecture of προσώπων for πρὸς αὐτόν, which Einarson and DeLacy omit.

> Therefore, hate comes about from a representation that the one hated is bad either generally or toward oneself (since, indeed, those who believe that they themselves have been treated unjustly naturally feel hatred, and they also censure and feel disgust toward those who act unjustly in other ways or are bad). But people simply feel envy toward those who seem to fare well. For this reason, envy seems to be without limit, just as a disease of the eyes is agitated in response to everything bright, but hate is bound by limits, since it always fixes itself against certain individual subjects.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Envy and Hate* 536F6–537A8)[93]

As with other spirited emotions, Plutarch treats hate and envy as passions (τὰ πάθη, *On Envy and Hate* 536F3–5)[94] that involve representational content and belief.[95] In the first clause we see that a representation (φαντασία) of injustice either within another's character or in their actions against oneself gives rise to hate. In the parenthetical explanation, Plutarch reformulates the perceived injustice in terms of belief (ἀδικεῖσθαι δόξαντες αὐτοί). This representation / belief issues in the passionate response of hate directed at particular individuals.

When Plutarch turns to the origins of envy, he condenses the description: people feel envy toward those who appear to fare well (τοῖς εὖ πράττειν δοκοῦσιν), using a form of δόξα. Not long after, he writes that envy involves a "representation that another is doing well or badly" (τοῦ εὖ πράττειν ἢ κακῶς ἕτερον φαντασίαν, *On Envy and Hate* 537B6–8), once again returning to the term φαντασία. Plutarch moves seamlessly between representation and belief

---

[93] Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2.4, 1382a2–7: We hate general types of people, like the thief or sycophant, but we are angry at particular individuals like Callias or Socrates (quoted in n. 87 above). Plutarch, like Aristotle, considers *scope* to be part of what differentiates emotions. Interestingly, Plutarch defines hate as directed at individual persons, while envy is less bounded. For a general discussion of hate in Aristotle see Konstan 2006, pp. 185–200. See also Fortenbaugh 1975, p. 15.

[94] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.5, 1105b21–3; *Eudemian Ethics* 2.2, 1220b12–14. Cf. also Cairns 1993, pp. 382–92: Against Fortenbaugh (1975, pp. 27–8 and 32) Cairns convincingly argues that shame is attributed to the passionate part of the soul in Plato's *Republic*, not the rational part. Cf. Bobonich 2002, p. 347, n. 85.

[95] On the representational capacity involved in Aristotle's definition of anger and other emotions see *On the Soul* 2.2, 413b12–32; 3.9, 432a22–b7; 3.10, 433b1–4; *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.1, 1102a26–32; *Eudemian Ethics* 2.1, 1219b32–6. Only a rational capacity can produce conviction (πίστις) and belief (δόξα) according to *On the Soul* 3.3, 428a18–24, which may indicate *commitment* to the way something appears, i.e. to certain representations (φαντασίαι, cf. Dow 2015, pp. 185–225, esp. p. 183–92 and the accompanying notes). Representations involved in emotions, if they belong to the non-rational part of the soul for Aristotle, appear to be different from beliefs and convictions. On the representational capacity (φαντασία) involved in emotions for Aristotle see Cooper 1996, pp. 246–7; Price 2009b, pp. 133–5; Moss 2012a, p. 70; Dow 2015, p. 189–213. Cf. also Caston 1996 and 1998.

in these passages.[96] As in other contexts, Plutarch usually does not treat the difference between the capacity for representation and belief as significant. In *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus*, Plutarch nearly equates the two (1017A8–B3, 1023F6–1024A8, 1030D7–E5).[97]

In addition to distinguishing hate from envy in terms of the structure and properties involved in their respective contents, Plutarch remarks that hate is common to both humans and beasts (cf. 537B3–4, C3–6), but that beasts are probably not capable of having a representation of "faring well" or "faring badly" and "a sense of glory" or "ill-repute":

[T79] ἐν τοῖς θηρίοις φθόνον μὲν οὐκ εἰκὸς ἐγγίνεσθαι πρὸς ἄλληλα (τοῦ γὰρ εὖ πράττειν ἢ κακῶς ἕτερον φαντασίαν οὐ λαμβάνουσιν, οὐδ' ἅπτεται τὸ ἔνδοξον ἢ ἄδοξον αὐτῶν, οἷς ὁ φθόνος ἐκτραχύνεται μάλιστα)· μισοῦσι δ' ἄλληλα καὶ ἀπεχθάνονται καὶ πολεμοῦσιν.

Among the beasts, it is not likely that envy occurs between them (for, they do not apprehend a representation that another is faring well or badly, and a sense of glory or ill-repute does not affect them, and these are the things that especially exasperate envy). But they [non-rational animals] do hate each other and incur each other's hatred and war against each other. (Plutarch, *On Envy and Hate* 537B5–9)

---

[96] Cf. also §A.II. and §A.III. in the Appendix to this chapter for the terminological overlap in some of Plato's dialogues.

[97] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 10, 602e4–603a8 (=[A6] in the Appendix), where Socrates appears to use representational and belief language interchangeably. An exception in Plutarch occurs in *Reply to Colotes* 1122C6–D8: "What then do they [Academics] avoid? Only what falsity and deception naturally grow in, namely, the formation of belief and being precipitous in giving assent" (τί οὖν φεύγουσι μόνον; ᾧ μόνῳ ψεῦδος ἐμφύεται καὶ ἀπάτη, τὸ δοξάζειν καὶ προπίπτειν τὴν συγκατάθεσιν, C6–8). Plutarch then asks what is needed for action and argues that only a representation of what is fitting (φαντασία τοῦ οἰκείου) and impulse (C9–D1, quoted in n. 73 above), but not belief (δόξα). The Academic argument does away with belief, not representation (δόξης γάρ, οὐχ ὁρμῆς οὐδὲ φαντασίας ὁ λόγος ἀφίστησιν, D2). It appears that rational belief and conviction is intended, i.e. a certain kind of commitment to a representation. See n. 95 above for a similar distinction in Aristotle.

It also appears that that the rational part of the soul can form beliefs (δόξαι) about physical objects and states of affairs in addition to having knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) of universals and eternal truths. Plutarch adopts the "Two-Worlds" thesis in which intelligible items that are eternal, unchanging, and incorporeal comprise one world and are more truly real than the sense-perceptible entities that exist in the second, physical world characterized by change (Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* 2, 1002C10–E1; *Reply to Colotes* 1114C4–D4; cf. Boys-Stones 1997a, pp. 228–30; Sierksma-Agteres 2015, esp. pp. 59–62). He also draws on the Divided Line argument of Plato's *Republic* (6, 509d1–511e4) to distinguish faculties of cognition that range over these two worlds, namely, the intelligible (τὸ νοούμενον) and the sense-perceptible (τὸ αἰσθητόν) or visible (τὸ ὁρώμενον, *Platonic Questions* 3, 1001C6–D3; cf. *Platonic Questions* 2, 1002D8–E1; cf. also Sierksma-Agteres 2015, pp. 60–66). Knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) ranges over the intelligible realm, belief (δόξα), over the sense-perceptive (Plato, *Republic* 7, 533e3–534a8; 5, 477a2–b10 and 6, 511d6–e4; Plutarch, *On Isis and Osiris* 382D2–383A7; *Platonic Questions* 3, 1002D2–E4; *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1023D10–1024D4; *Reply to Colotes* 1114C4–D9). In setting out this division between belief and knowledge based on the objects cognized by these faculties, Plutarch does not deny belief to the rational part of the soul nor claim that belief is always false.

What seems to be denied here is that animals evaluate character and the conditions of others except insofar as they are somehow directly related to themselves. Let me explain beginning with hate.

In the case of hate, its cause may be the representation that someone is bad in general *or* toward oneself (πονηρὸς ἢ κοινῶς ἢ πρὸς αὐτόν, 536F6–537A1 in [T78]). The causes of hate are given in a disjunctive form which would allow Plutarch to deny that animals evaluate character in terms of good or bad apart from how they are *directly* affected. Someone could be bad toward oneself inasmuch as they have caused harm to oneself or are perceived to be a threat, i.e. a probable cause of harm to oneself.[98] Animals need not perceive that the perpetrator is bad in some more general sense (πονηρὸς κοινῶς), such as in his character, which might require an evaluation of his habits and person beyond how he is directly related to or has directly affected the animal.[99]

In the case of envy, however, certain essential features of the emotion are inaccessible to non-human animals. Representations of glory and ill-repute are beyond animal apprehension. Whether someone is faring well or faring badly likewise does not grip them. Where hate can be roused in animals due to the harm they receive from others, instances in which envy is vexed that

[98] One might think that Plutarch means something different by the hate that animals have toward one another, since in 537C1–4, he writes "It is likely that fear has given birth to strong hate in the lion against the rooster and the elephant against the boar, since what they fear they also naturally hate" (εἰκὸς δὲ καὶ τῷ λέοντι πρὸς τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα καὶ τῷ ἐλέφαντι πρὸς τὴν ὗν μῖσος ἰσχυρὸν γεγεννηκέναι τὸν φόβον· ὃ γὰρ δεδίασι, καὶ μισεῖν πεφύκασιν). While it may look as though fear is the origin of hate in animals, it could simply be the case that fear intensifies hate: "fear has given birth to *strong* hate." Hate and fear naturally occur together *when there is fear*, since "what they fear they also naturally hate," but it is not clear from the passage that fear must be present for there to be hate in animals. Cf. also Stob. 4.7.20: "Desire that those who live with you respect you more than they fear you, since reverence comes hand in hand with respect, while hate comes along with fear" (θέλε μᾶλλον τοὺς συνόντας σοι αἰδεῖσθαί σε ἢ φοβεῖσθαι· αἰδοῖ μὲν γὰρ πρόσεστι σέβας, φόβῳ δὲ μῖσος).

[99] For Aristotle, we feel anger toward those who do us harm, but we can feel enmity (ἔχθρα) toward others even without being harmed by them if we believe that they are of a certain kind of character (*Rhetoric* 2.4, 1382a3–5).

another individual seems to fare better than oneself but has not caused injury to oneself are irrelevant to them (538C4–E5).

Animals might still comprehend a notion of their ranking among other members of their species, but it would not be in terms of reputation as it is described in the definition of envy. Imagine the case of non-human animals, such as wolves, who enter into contests for dominance within their pack. In these instances, they are competing against one another, and their own standing in relation to each other is directly affected by the outcomes of these contests. The wolf who prevails will have a higher ranking in the pack than the one who submits. Envy, however, considers whether another, who is not competing directly with oneself in a confrontation, is faring well or badly or has a good or bad reputation. The notions of reputation and of faring well or badly are divorced from a ranking system determined by direct conflict here. These notions depend on other systems of ranking, such as honors earned by one's actions or according to some other standard of evaluation like wealth.

We might consider the example of the ranking systems of the *Iliad* as a parallel. Achilles is first and best in skill and prowess. In direct, one-on-one combat with Agamemnon, he would prevail and be higher ranked. Agamemnon, on the other hand, is best according to another ranking system, namely, how many men swear allegiance to him and follow him into battle.[100] Animals might be able to enter into the ranking system of Achilles and understand ranking based on direct conflict, but the standards by which Agamemnon is best would be entirely irrelevant to them.

These distinctions bring out, once again, the notion of a projected other. Hating someone for their perceived bad character, especially when it is not concerned with how they have

[100] On these two ranking systems in the *Iliad* see Kim 2000, esp. Chapter 3, and Wilson 2002.

affected oneself, involves the attribution of shameful or honorable features to another individual *from a distance*. The projection seems further removed and more abstract in nature than feeling hate due to the harm and pain caused more directly to oneself. The projection involved in envy seems similar. We envy from a distance, since the condition or status of those we envy has no direct effect on us.

In the examples of spirited emotions that we have explored in this section, we see that complex representational content varies in structure and in complexity. Nevertheless, standards of what is honorable or shameful are involved and are used to evaluate desires and actions in a number of spirited emotions. In certain cases, they are even used to evaluate habits and character.

§VII Internalizing Standards and Forming Beliefs

The next question to ask, which I have not sufficiently addressed up to this point, is whether these emotions require a partnership between the rational part of the soul and the spirited part of the soul for evaluative representations and emotional reactions to occur. In the case of anger, for example, does Plutarch imagine that the rational part of the soul is responsible for evaluating whether one has been slighted or treated unjustly while the spirited part of the soul merely provides an affective response?[101]

We might think that Plutarch already has a simple answer to this question. Spirited emotions can be in disagreement with our rational judgments and oppose them (*On Moral Virtue* 449B11–C3=[T65]). If that is the case, then the spirited part of the soul may have its own representations that conflict with those that belong to the rational part of the soul and psychic

[101] Bobonich 2002, pp. 259–67, 295–8, 316–31, 343–5, and 2010a, holds a view of this kind for Plato's later dialogues. See nn. 38, 41 and 75 above.

conflict may involve conflict of belief.[102] The fact that emotional reactions can vary from rational judgments, however, does not prove that the non-rational passionate parts of the soul *form* their own judgments independently of reason. As I explore in the Appendix (§A.IV.), it is possible that the non-rational passionate parts of the soul respond only to certain *types* of information, which can cause them to differ in their reactions from the final judgments of the rational part of the soul, even if all belief-formation occurs in the rational part of the soul.

As I argue there, it may be the case that the rational part of the soul provides all of the evaluative content in the soul. The spirited part reacts to certain features while not taking into account others. It reacts without calculation (ἀλογίστως) and bids us to retaliate, for instance, when the relevant information of being slighted or treated unjustly reaches it. Only these features are salient and important to the spirited part of the soul.[103] The rational part of the soul, however, takes more information into consideration and calculates about what is better or worse, the right time to act, etc. It may be best, given other conditions, not to retaliate now, or perhaps not at all, since it may be the case that our first impressions that we were slighted were incorrect. With greater consideration of more details, the rational part of the soul may determine that it is not best to retaliate now, even though the spirited part of the soul prompts us to act immediately.[104]

---

[102] In *Republic* 10 (602e4–603a8=[A6] in the Appendix), Socrates appears to describe a conflict of *belief* between the rational and non-rational parts of the soul. See Appendix §A.II.

[103] Cf. Ben-Ze-ev 1997, p. 196: "The partiality of emotions is clearly demonstrated by their intentional components, namely, cognition, evaluation, and motivation. The cognitive field of emotions does not engage varied and broad perspectives of our surroundings but a narrow and fragmentary perspective focused upon an emotional object and a subject-object relation."

[104] In §A.IV., I present two models to explain how spirited passions can come to be opposed to rational evaluation, even if all information is top-down and all belief-formation and evaluation occurs in the rational part of the soul to be translated / transmitted to the non-rational parts of the soul. In Model 1, the spirited part of the soul reacts *only to certain types of information* and is not responsive to other types of information that are important in deciding the best response. In the example of Odysseus opposing his spirited anger through rational calculation (*Republic* 4, 441b3–c2), Odysseus' anger without calculation (ἀλογίστως) reacts to the evaluation that he has been treated unjustly, which provokes his angry desire for revenge. The rational part of his soul is responsible for having this evaluation that Odysseus has been treated unjustly and that revenge is suitable, but in addition to this evaluative judgment, to which the spirited part of the soul reacts, the rational part of Odysseus' soul also takes into account other information to which the spirited part of the soul is deaf, namely, it calculates about timing and better

Returning to the examples I discussed in §II above, we will see that the spirited part of the soul is able to apply evaluative standards independently of the rational part of the soul. The standards by which desires are judged may originate in reason and from the guidance of other rational agents in our early childhood training. Nevertheless, the spirited part of the soul must use these standards in certain instances without receiving instructions from others and without receiving instructions from the rational part of the soul. This does not prove that the spirited part of the soul is responsible for all evaluative judgments involved in spirited emotions, but it does show that the spirited part of the soul is capable of evaluating actions apart from the rational part of the soul.

Let us begin with the inculcation of standards of honor and shame and with Plutarch's example of the beasts that pull the cart when the leader lets loose the reins (Plutarch, *On Moral Progress* 83A4–B8=[T64]). I repeat part of that quotation for the reader's convenience:

> ὥσπερ οὖν τὰ πεπαιδευμένα καλῶς τῶν ὑποζυγίων, οὐδ' ἂν ἀφῇ τὰς ἡνίας ὁ ἄρχων, ἐπιχειρεῖ παρατρέπεσθαι καὶ ἀπολείπειν τὴν ὁδόν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἴθισται πρόεισιν ἐν τάξει, διαφυλάττοντα τὴν πορείαν ἄπταιστον, οὕτως οἷς ἂν εὐπειθὲς τὸ ἄλογον ἤδη καὶ πρᾶον ᾖ γεγονὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου καὶ κεκολασμένον, οὔτε καθ' ὕπνους οὔθ' ὑπὸ νόσων ἔτι ῥᾳδίως ἐξυβρίζειν ἢ παρανομεῖν ἐθέλει ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ τηρεῖ καὶ διαμνημονεύει τὸν ἐθισμόν, ἰσχὺν ἐμποιοῦντα τῇ προσοχῇ καὶ τόνον.
>
> Therefore, just as beasts of burden that have been well trained do not attempt to turn aside or abandon the path if their leader lets loose the reins, but instead proceed in order just as they have become accustomed to do, maintaining the course without error, in the same way, whoever has had their non-rational part of soul already made tame and disciplined by reason, it [their non-rational part of soul] is not readily willing in sleep nor

---

circumstances in which one should take one's revenge, calculating ((ἀνα-)λογίζεσθαι) about what is better or worse (περὶ τοῦ βελτίονός τε καὶ χείρονος). In Model 2, the analysis of an angry reaction is similar to Model 1, but differs insofar as *the rational part of the soul forms two different evaluative judgments at different times*. First, the rational part of the soul forms the belief that revenge is warranted because one has suffered an injustice. The spirited part of the soul receives and responds to this evaluation. Unlike in Model 1, this rational evaluation is modified and reevaluated at a subsequent point in time so that the rational part of the soul comes to hold an evaluative judgment that is contrary to its first. The spirited part of the soul holds on to the initial evaluation *against* this second rational evaluation, which leads to critical conflict of belief and pursued actions. Both models provide a way in which all rational evaluation can originate within the rational part of the soul but still lead to critical psychic conflict between the rational and spirited parts of the soul.

still in the throes of illness to act insolently or lawlessly due to desires, but it carefully guards and holds fast to the memory of what has become its accustomed habit, implanting strength and intensity to our diligence.

(Plutarch, *On Moral Progress* 83A9–B8, part of [T64])

The internalization of these standards of propriety, shame, and honor are described as a form of habituation in [T64]: the spirited part of the soul retains, as though in memory, a habituated orientation to act.

While retaining an *accustomed habit* (ἐθισμός) seems a far cry from more advanced cognitive senses of memory or the inculcation of beliefs about what is honorable or shameful, a passage in Plutarch's *Beasts are Rational* gives an example in which habituation is assimilated to reception and retention of rational *instruction* and *teaching*. In a long list of examples given as evidence that non-rational animals are endowed with rational powers, Gryllus, Odysseus' former comrade turned into a pig by Circe, explains to Odysseus that when partridges habituate (ἐθίζειν) their young to lie back and cover themselves with mud, this habituation is an example that shows that they retain the teaching of their parents:

[T80] ὅσα γοῦν ἄνθρωποι τρυφῶντες ἢ παίζοντες εἰς τὸ μανθάνειν καὶ μελετᾶν ἄγουσι, τούτων ἡ διάνοια καὶ παρὰ φύσιν τοῦ σώματος[105] περιουσίᾳ συνέσεως ἀναλαμβάνει τὰς μαθήσεις. ἐὼ γὰρ ἰχνεύειν σκύλακας καὶ βαδίζειν ἐν ῥυθμῷ πώλους μελετῶντας, ἀλλὰ κόρακας διαλέγεσθαι καὶ κύνας ἅλλεσθαι διὰ τροχῶν περιφερομένων. ἵπποι δὲ καὶ βόες ἐν θεάτροις κατακλίσεις καὶ χορείας καὶ στάσεις παραβόλους καὶ κινήσεις οὐδ' ἀνθρώποις πάνυ ῥᾳδίας ἀκριβοῦσιν ἐκδιδασκόμενοι καὶ μνημονεύοντες εὐμαθείας ἐπίδειξιν εἰς[106] ἄλλο οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς χρήσιμον ἔχουσαν[107]. εἰ δ' ἀπιστεῖς ὅτι τέχνας μανθάνομεν, ἄκουσον ὅτι καὶ διδάσκομεν. αἵ τε γὰρ πέρδικες ἐν τῷ προφεύγειν τοὺς νεοττοὺς ἐθίζουσιν ἀποκρύπτεσθαι καὶ προΐσχεσθαι βῶλον ἀνθ' ἑαυτῶν τοῖς ποσὶν ὑπτίους ἀναπεσόντας· καὶ τοῖς πελαργιδεῦσιν ὁρᾷς ἐπὶ τῶν τεγῶν ὡς οἱ τέλειοι παρόντες ἀναπειρωμένοις ὑφηγοῦνται τὴν πτῆσιν.

Therefore, as many animals, at any rate, that humans in an indulgent lifestyle or out of frivolity drive to *learn* and practice, the faculty of *thought* of these animals receives these *instructions* with an abundance of *understanding*, even when it is contary to the nature of

[105] Following Helmbold who deletes the καί printed by Reiske.
[106] Following Helmbold who prints εἰς; Reiske prints ὡς.
[107] Following Helmbold who prints ἔχουσαν; Wyttenbach prints ἔχουσιν.

their body. For, I leave off that puppies practice following tracks[108] and colts practice walking in rhythm,[109] while crows are trained to speak, dogs to leap through spinning hoops. And horses and bulls in the theatres execute with precision lying down, dancing, standing in precarious positions, and movements that not even humans perform easily because *they have been thoroughly taught* to do these things and they *retain these instructions in their memory* as a display of their *readiness to learn*, though this display has no other useful purpose whatsover.[110] But if you do not believe that we can *learn* crafts, take to heart the fact that we even *teach* them. For patridges *habituate* their young to hide and to place in front of themselves a clod of earth with their feet, throwing themselves on their back, while they flee from danger. You can also see upon roofs that adult storks, standing next to their fledglings, *instruct* them as they attempt again and again to take flight. (Plutarch, *Beasts are Rational* 992A5–B10)[111]

Note the terminology of teaching (διδάσκειν), being taught (διδάσκεσθαι), learning (μανθάνειν), and retaining in memory (μνημονεύειν), as well as the necessity of thought (διάνοια) and understanding (σύνεσις) in the passage surrounding the use of habituation (ἐθίζειν). Habituation is not a cognitively void affair, but in these instances involves instruction and retention of what one has been taught. Plutarch's switch to habituation in [T80] from more

[108] Cf. Plutarch, *On the Cleverness of Animals* 969A9–B10. Chryisppus presented a puzzle for the Stoic denial of animal cognition, using the example of a dog that seems to use syllogistic reasoning, which the Stoics deny to animals, to determine that its prey went down a certain path (S.E. *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, 1.69-70=LS 36E; cf. also Porphyry, *On Abstinence from Eating Flesh* 3.6; Aelian, *On the Nature of Animals* 6.59; Basil, *Hexaemeron* 9.4). Cf. Sorabji 1993, p. 46. In *On the Cleverness of Animals*, Plutarch denies that the dog is using a syllogism. The representational capacity of the dog, using perception and tracking, is sufficient to account for how the animal follows one path over another, rather than puzzling over whether or not the dog reasons something such as, "The prey either went down this way (i) or that way (ii) or that other way (iii). But not this way (i) or that way (ii). Therefore, that other way (iii)" (ἤτοι τῇδε ἢ τῇδε ἢ τῇδε διῆλθε τὸ θηρίον· οὔτε δὲ τῇδε οὔτε τῇδε· τῇδε ἄρα, S.E. *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, 1.69–70=LS 36E). Tracking, then, is not something Plutarch considers a cognitively complex capacity on par with syllogistic reasoning. He does not deny, however, that it could require or be refined by teaching and practice, as we see in this passage. Puppies practicing tracking is dismissed as part of a *praeteritio*. It is treated as evidence that animals can learn but is not the main point that Gryllus uses to demonstrate that animals learn.

[109] Cf. Plato, *Laws* 2, 653e3–5, which seems to deny a sense of rhythm to non-rational animals: "Therefore, the other animals do not have a perception of order or disorder in movements, to which belong the names of rhythm and harmony" (τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα ζῷα οὐκ ἔχειν αἴσθησιν τῶν ἐν ταῖς κινήσεσιν τάξεων οὐδὲ ἀταξιῶν, οἷς δὴ ῥυθμὸς ὄνομα καὶ ἁρμονία); cf. 2, 664e–665a.

[110] Cf. *On the Cleverness of Animals* 968B10–C3.

[111] Cf. Plutarch's *On the Cleverness of Animals* 971C5–9: "And partridges display another example of cleverness together with the love of their offspring at the same time, habituating their young who are not yet able to flee to throw themselves on their backs whenever they are being hunted and to put a clod of earth or refuse over their body as concealment" (ἄλλην δὲ πανουργίαν ὁμοῦ μετὰ τοῦ φιλοστόργου πέρδικες ἐπιδεικνύντες τοὺς μὲν νεοττοὺς ἐθίζουσι μηδέπω φεύγειν δυναμένους, ὅταν διώκωνται, καταβαλόντας ὑπτίους ἑαυτοὺς βῶλόν τιν' ἢ συρφετὸν ἄνω προΐσχεσθαι τοῦ σώματος οἷον ἐπηλυγαζομένους).

cognitively loaded terms of teaching, being taught, learning, and retaining in memory is an example of *variatio* here, as well as the final verb in the passage that describes the instruction (ὑφηγεῖσθαι) in flight that storks provide to their fledgings. Gryllus, in fact, gives the partridges' habituation of their young as an example of a craft that "we," i.e. non-human animals like Gryllus himself, teach (διδάσκομεν) to each other.[112]

The speaker in this passage, Gryllus, has a particularly strong motivation to assimilate the habituated actions of animals as proof of their rational capacity to learn, since he is arguing with Odysseus that his new porcine form is superior and preferable to his old human condition. He claims not only that non-human animals are rational, as many of their more complex actions prove, but also that non-human animals are naturally more virtuous than humans. They are less capable of the kinds of error that arise from more advanced rational capacities in humans (986F1–988E10).[113] While the context of [T80] may make the assimilation of habituation to learning and retaining instruction suspect, given the rhetorical strategy of Gryllus, it nevertheless fits with the description of the early education of the passions, which reveals that certain *beliefs* about what is honorable and shameful may be planted in the soul through habituation.

Since I discuss the education of our spirited emotions more fully in the next chapter, and because I already introduced this topic above, I will only provide a few points of interest here.

---

[112] Cf. *On the Education of Children* 2A8–B5: "For complete virtuous action, three things must come together: nature, reason, and habit. I mean by reason, learning, and by habit, practice. The starting-points belong to our nature, advancements to learning, and uses to practice, and the perfection to all of these. Insofar as these are lacking, to that same extent one's virtue necessarily turns out to be deficient. For nature without learning is something blind, learning apart from nature is lacking, and practice barring both [nature and learning] is incomplete" (εἰς τὴν παντελῆ δικαιοπραγίαν τρία δεῖ συνδραμεῖν, φύσιν καὶ λόγον καὶ ἔθος. καλῶ δὲ λόγον μὲν τὴν μάθησιν, ἔθος δὲ τὴν ἄσκησιν. εἰσὶ δ' αἱ μὲν ἀρχαὶ τῆς φύσεως, αἱ δὲ προκοπαὶ τῆς μαθήσεως, αἱ δὲ χρήσεις τῆς μελέτης, αἱ δ' ἀκρότητες πάντων. καθ' ὃ δ' ἂν λειφθῇ τούτων, κατὰ τοῦτ' ἀνάγκη χωλὴν γίγνεσθαι τὴν ἀρετήν. ἡ μὲν γὰρ φύσις ἄνευ μαθήσεως τυφλόν, ἡ δὲ μάθησις δίχα φύσεως ἐλλιπές, ἡ δ' ἄσκησις χωρὶς ἀμφοῖν ἀτελές). Although this work is generally agreed to be spuriously attributed to Plutarch (see n. 39 in Chapter 5), it supports the notion that habituation depends on a capacity to learn, since practice, which produces habit, is incomplete without learning.

[113] See n. 101 of Chapter 5 on the notion of natural virtue.

Plutarch describes the education of our spirited passions with the Platonic image of dyeing the soul with a hue that is hard to remove (Plutarch, *Philosophers and Men in Power* 779C1–6; *On Moral Virtue* 443D1–10). That image in the *Republic* describes the internalization of *beliefs* (δόξαι) within the guardians about what is appropriate or not, including aversion to actions that are shameful (4, 429b1–430b5). The guardian class is the analogue to the spirited part of the soul, and it is through the spirited part of the soul that the guardians are said to preserve these beliefs which *guide* their actions (4, 442b10–c2).[114]

One's earliest education of these passions, moreover, occurs *before* the rational part of the soul is well developed in children.[115] Plutarch, like Plato, describes our passions as *shaped* and *molded* from our earliest moments so that we take pleasure in what is honorable and feel pain toward was is shameful; we are habituated to develop certain orientations toward actions before we can reason about them.[116] These orientations involve evaluative representations that guide our behavior and help us regulate our appetites, especially in instances where our educators let loose the reins, as it were, and give us freedom to choose whether we will indulge in inappropriate desires or maintain self-control over them.[117]

The clearest evidence that the spirited part of the soul evaluates actions, however, occurs in Plutarch's description of periods of sleep ([T64]). As in the image of beasts that pull the cart,

---

[114] =[A14] in the Appendix. Cf. Wilberding 2009, pp. 361–4, who takes the inculcation of evaluations to apply to rational formation, not formation of the spirited part of the soul. *Contra* Wilberding, I take the isomorphic relationship between the city of speech and parts of the soul, and the corresponding virtues that apply to each, to make a strong connection between how courage is informed in the city and how it is also informed in the spirited part of the soul. According to the passage I cite here, it is by means of one particular part of the soul (τῷ μέρει), the spirited part (τὸ θυμοειδές), that we preserve the standards of appropriate behavior. Cf. also Wilburn 2015, who argues that moral education of the spirited part of the soul in the *Republic* helps provide stability to belief before one comes to have more secure knowledge about what is good and bad and what is honorable and shameful.

[115] See nn. 26–29 above and §II.

[116] Plutarch, *Can Virtue be Taught* 439F2–5, *On Moral Virtue* 452D8–12. Cf. Plato, *Republic* 2, 377c3–6; *Laws* 2, 653a5–c4, 659d4–e5; 7, 808d1–e4. Cf. also Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.3, 1104b11–16. I discuss these points and passages in Chapter 5.

[117] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 3, 413d6–414a6.

these ingrained beliefs, which the spirited part of the soul retains, continue to guide actions and to regulate desires and behavior even when the rational part of the soul is inactive. More than simply following the path, Plutarch indicates that the spirited part of the soul refuses to condone errant passions. If we follow through with the example and the analogy, we see that the spirited part of the soul must be *applying* these standards of belief to determine which desires are acceptable and which are errant. Errant desires arise in the soul like new obstacles one chances upon on a path. The beasts pulling the cart take steps along a familiar path, but not every patch under foot will be the same as it was on the last journey. Furthermore, obstacles may be encountered along the way. When the animals come across these obstacles, if the rider is asleep or not paying attention, the animals themselves must make adjustments to keep everything moving in the right direction.

In similar fashion, the spirited part of the soul, unbidden and unaided by the rational part of the soul in sleep, will evaluate and react to errant desires it encounters in one's dreams. Some of the lawless and perverse desires it encounters may be of the same type that it has seen before, but it may also come across new and unfamiliar desires. In either case, the spirited part of the soul reacts to these desires without calling upon the resources of the rational part of the soul. It applies standards of what is shameful or honorable, appropriate and illicit, and it makes evaluative judgments about the desires it encounters. If it comes across a new type of desire that it does not recognize, it must *form* a belief about this desire, deciding whether it conforms to the standards of what is appropriate and honorable.

If we look closely at Plutarch's analogies, we see that the spirited part of the soul plays an important role in regulating appetites and behavior even apart from the rational part of the soul's commands. The spirited part of the soul is shaped to retain certain dispositions toward types of

desires and actions and to evaluate these desires and actions as shameful or honorable. It can oppose errant desires on its own according to internalized standards of evaluation of what is appropriate and honorable, and it can help ensure that we are on a path to virtue, even before we are able to reflect on why we should do what we do beyond the perception of our actions as conforming to what is acceptable and admirable.

***

Given the capacities attributed to the spirited part of the soul, it is shocking that so many Plutarchean scholars consider the spirited part of the soul to be unimportant to Plutarch's moral psychology.[118] I have tried to show that we should not be too quick to neglect the important functions that Plutarch assigns to the spirited part of the soul in moral progress. Plutarch may often refer to both the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul without distinguishing the two, but we should be careful not to fall into the trap of thinking that Plutarch's soul is essentially bipartite and that he only treats the non-rational parts of the soul as distinct when he feels the need to emphasize Platonic precedent.[119]

Instead, when we read the distinctions that Plutarch makes about the differentia of representational content and capacities of the spirited part of the soul together with his discussions of the evaluative representations involved in spirited emotions, we find that Plutarch's moral psychology, far from neglecting the differences between the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul, carves out an interesting and important role for the spirited part of the soul based on them. As we will explore in the next chapter, the habituation of our passions is the

[118] Westaway 1922, p. 41; Vander Waerdt 1985b, pp. 284–6; Opsomer 1994, pp. 33–6; 1998, pp. 33–6; 2006, p. 213; 2012, pp. 316–24 and n. 68; Beneker 2012, pp. 12–17. See §V.a. in the Introduction.
[119] Cf. Karamanolis 2006, pp. 115–23. Cf. also Opsomer 2007a, p. 154, n. 15. See also Wilburn 2013, who similarly argues against the view that Plato's moral psychology becomes essentially bipartite in the *Laws*, which some believe is indicated by the lack of an explicit distinction made between spirited emotions and the spirited part of the soul in Plato's *Laws*.

most important and foundational aspect of moral education for Plutarch. If well nurtured and trained, spirited passions and a well-attuned sense of honor and shame are able not only to redirect one away from shameful courses of action, but also to give direction to the young as they take their first steps on the path to virtue (Plutarch, *Can Virtue be Taught* 439F2–5).

CHAPTER 5

Honor, Shame, and Early Education

Building on the last chapter, we now turn to the positive role that non-rational passions, particularly those of the spirited part of the soul, can play in redirecting and keeping us on the path to virtue, i.e. in ethical education. While several recent studies focus on important aspects of ethical education in Plutarch's works,[1] my focus in this chapter will be an important thread running throughout Plutarch's view of education, which has not been sufficiently explored or appreciated. From early childhood through later stages of education in which we begin to shape our own passions and character, one's sense of shame plays an important and positive role as we begin our journey and make progress, as Plutarch describes it, on the path to virtue.[2]

In the first section, we will look at the role that Plutarch carves out for non-rational persuasion (ψυχαγωγία), which can be used to change others' intentions and redirect them

[1] Xenophontos 2016 presents the most recent and comprehensive work on ethical education in both Plutarch's *Moralia* and *Lives*. Cf. Duff 1999, who focuses on Plutarch's educational views and efforts to reach his readers in the *Lives*. For a detailed study of educational aims in several works from Plutarch's *Moralia*, namely, *On Tranquility of Mind*, *On Exile*, *On Talkativeness*, *On Being a Busybody*, and *Advice on Keeping Well*, see Van Hoof 2010. I will refer to other studies of interest on this topic in the notes that follow. My study of early education in Plutarch will focus primarily on the theoretical aspects of ethical training for virtue that are found in Plutarch's *Moralia*, though I also draw upon instances from the *Lives* as well. While not comprehensive, my purpose in this chapter is to highlight the positive role that passions play in our ethical formation. I will have little to say on the importance of more rational studies that lead up to and include dialectic and training in philosophy, except insofar as Plutarch contrasts their importance with the need to form our passionate nature in preparation for a life of virtue.

[2] As both Cairns 1993 (p. 372, n. 83, and p. 373, n. 86) and Konstan 2006 (pp. 91–110) note, the terminology for respect / a sense of shame (αἰδώς) and the feeling of being ashamed (αἰσχύνη) become generally interchangeable by the time of Plato, though the former in older usage tended to be prospective in the desire to show due respect and avoid incurring shame, while the latter denoted retrospective remorse and regret for past offenses. Throughout this chapter I am concerned primarily with the prospective sense of shame, insofar as it denotes a desire for honor and an aversion to shame, though for Plutarch that also includes in later stages of development retrospective reflection (ἐπιλογισμός) upon one's past faults to correct one's moral failings and the dispositions that led to them (§IV).

to a different course of action, sometimes even against their own rational calculations. One's sense of shame and desire for honor, emotions belonging to the spirited part of the soul, can be used to powerful effect to alter others' behavior. While in this first section I do not discuss Plutarch's view of education, the examples drawn upon highlight how spirited emotions, particularly a sense of shame, can be put to good use in redirecting others, which will be important for the discussion of education that follows.

In the second section, we will turn to Plutarch's view on the importance of early education and its effect on non-rational passions. Drawing upon while at the same correcting Xenocrates, a former head of Plato's Academy, Plutarch describes passions as the "grips of philosophy" (λαβαὶ φιλοσοφίας), which serve as the point at which virtue starts to take hold of our lives. In Xenocrates' view, education in music, geometry, and astronomy serves as *preparation* and as the starting-point for philosophy to make its first grip on the soul. Against Xenocrates, Plutarch argues that the formation of our passionate nature, particularly the spirited part of the soul, provides the most important preparation for education in virtue, setting our first step on the path to virtue. Plutarch takes the grips of philosophy in several senses. Passions not only develop early on and lay the foundation for our further progress, the greatest *preparation* for a life oriented to virtue, but also grip the soul to help *guide* our progress toward virtue. They also maintain an *enduring hold* on our character as it develops.

In the third section, I take up the topic of whether Plutarch pits Aristotle against Plato by emphasizing the importance of habituation in ethical education over later studies. Emphasis on the habituation of passions appears far more developed and emphasized in Aristotle's ethics than in, say, Plato's *Republic*. If we turn to Plato's *Laws* 1–2, however, we find that habituation of passions is not only called true education but is also described as the first means by which

children begin to develop virtues. Aristotle, moreover, attributes to Plato the view that early education consists in habituating passions, with *Laws* 1–2 being the probable point of reference.

The fourth section concerns the continued role of a sense of shame and desire for honor in later moral progress. As one becomes more autonomous and begins to shape one's own character and passions, a proper sensitivity to praise and blame is a sign of a healthy soul. It also allows for one to self-diagnose and begin to treat flaws within one's own character.

In the final section we return to the topic of being swayed to act contrary to one's own rational judgments and calculations through praise and blame. Plutarch presents a cautionary tale that illumines not only the ambivalent potential of being persuaded to good or bad ends through passions, but also the vulnerability of a well-developed sense of shame that is not anchored, as it were, to reason. Unless we form firm convictions through philosophy, we are open to being tossed about, even if we maintain a generally good and proper sensitivity to praise and blame. Early education that habituates our passionate nature is important for Plutarch but far from sufficient for producing the stability of character necessary for virtue.

§I Shame, Honor, and Non-Rational Persuasion (ψυχαγωγία)

In the last chapter and its appendix, we found a distinction drawn in *Republic* 4 between the cognitive content to which spirited emotions react and the kinds of information that only the rational part of the soul seems to entertain and take into account. Spirited emotions such as anger and a sense of shame are triggered by representations in which codes of conduct are violated or harm and personal honor are at stake. The rational part of the soul takes further information into account when deliberating and weighing what is better or worse in situations (ἀναλογισάμενον …περὶ τοῦ βελτίονός τε καὶ χείρονος), while the spirited part of the soul reacts without calculations (ἀλογίστως, Plato, *Republic* 4, 441b3–c2).

We find in the following examples that Plutarch has the same basic distinction in mind. He adds, however, that even when someone fails to reason through to the conclusion that they should alter their responses, the emotion of shame can be used as a tool to persuade them to change their intentions. Spirited emotions can thus be put to positive use in persuading others to change their actions for the better, overpowering or circumventing others' calculations or lack of correct reasoning.

In his biographical work on Demosthenes, Plutarch describes the power of emotions in his analysis of the power of rhetoric. The orator Demosthenes attempts to call the Thebans to make a stand with Athens against Philip of Macedon after the Third Sacred War:

[T81] τὸ μὲν οὖν συμφέρον οὐ διέφευγε τοὺς τῶν Θηβαίων λογισμούς, ἀλλ' ἐν ὄμμασιν ἕκαστος εἶχε τὰ τοῦ πολέμου δεινά, τῶν Φωκικῶν ἔτι τραυμάτων νεαρῶν παραμενόντων· ἡ δὲ τοῦ ῥήτορος δύναμις, ὥς φησι Θεόπομπος, ἐκριπίζουσα τὸν θυμὸν αὐτῶν καὶ διακαίουσα τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ἐπεσκότησε τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν, ὥστε καὶ φόβον καὶ λογισμὸν καὶ χάριν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐνθουσιῶντας ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὸ καλόν.

> What was to their own benefit, then, did not escape the calculations of the Thebans, but each had before his eyes the horrors of war, since their Phocian defeat was still near and fresh in mind. But the power of the orator, as Theopompus says [*FGrH* 115 F 328], stirring up their spirit and igniting their love of honor, obscured all else, with the result that they cast off their fear, calculation, and sense of obliged return of favors, inspired by his [Demosthenes'] speech toward the pursuit of honor. (Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 18.2–3)

While the Thebans at first calculate what is to their own interest, considering the horrors of war and their previous losses, Demosthenes persuades them back to the fight by appealing to their spirited passions. Demosthenes, in fact, turns the Thebans back to the pursuit of what is honorable *against* their rational calculations. Instead of arguing with them to change their minds, Demosthenes helps the Theban men *forget* their reasons for hesitancy and fear, *obscuring* (ἐπισκοτεῖν) their rational calculation (λογισμός), by stoking the flames of their anger and

desire for honor (θυμὸς καὶ φιλοτιμία).[3] His appeal to their emotions overpowers and circumvents their rational calculation for self-preservation, which Plutarch commends as a laudable endeavor on Demosthenes' part (*Demosthenes* 13.5–6).[4] The result is that Demosthenes induces the Thebans to stand with Athens; Philip consequently sends an embassy seeking peace.[5]

The notion of *persuasion* by emotion, however, seems to be problematic, given that persuasion is said to belong to the rational part of the soul alone:

---

[3] Consider also Plutarch's discussion of how anger can distort our representations, as, for example, when in an angry and agitated state the severity of matters can appear greatly distorted, as though magnified through a lens: "For as bodies appear larger through a mist, likewise do matters appear greater when seen through anger" (ὡς γὰρ δι' ὁμίχλης τὰ σώματα, καὶ δι' ὀργῆς τὰ πράγματα μείζονα φαίνεται, *On the Control of Anger* 460A4–5). In certain cases, one's anger can lead to a state of inordinate, implacable rage: "Nevertheless, the other passions, even at the time when they are most intense, in some way yield and allow reason to enter into the soul from outside and help, but rage…completely shuts our wits out of doors and locks them out, just as people who light themselves on fire together with their homes fill everything inside with confusion, smoke, and clamor, with the result that the soul cannot see or hear anyone who tries to help them" (ὅμως δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καὶ παρ' ὃν ἀκμάζει καιρὸν ἀμωσγέπως ὑπείκει καὶ παρίησι βοηθοῦντα λόγον ἔξωθεν εἰς τὴν ψυχήν, ὁ δὲ θυμὸς… τὰς φρένας…ἐξοικίσας τελείως καὶ ἀποκλείσας, ὥσπερ οἱ συνεμπιπράντες ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς οἰκίαις, πάντα ταραχῆς καὶ καπνοῦ καὶ ψόφου μεστὰ ποιεῖ τὰ ἐντός, ὥστε μήτ' ἰδεῖν μήτ' ἀκοῦσαι τῶν ὠφελούντων, *ibid*. E7–F3). Cf. also Plutarch, *Timoleon* 6.1–2, discussed below in §V, where Timoleon is described as knocked out of his own rational calculations due to shame (ἐκκρουόμεναι τῶν οἰκείων λογισμῶν), as the representation of what was noble faded away (ἀπομαραινομένης τῆς τοῦ καλοῦ φαντασίας, 6.4). See also Chapter 4, n. 11.

On distorted representations in Plato's *Republic* 10, 602e4–603a8=[A6] and *Philebus* 38c5–7=[A9], see the Appendix to Chapter 4, §A.II–§A.III. For Aristotle's account of representational distortion see *On Dreams* 3: The corporeal aspect of bodily heat from food or the elements in wine has an effect on our representations during sleep. See especially 461a21–5: "And sometimes there are representations of appearances that are confused and monstrous, and their dreams are not describable, as, for example, the dreams of those who are melancholic, have a fever, or are drunk with wine, for all affections of that sort, since they are of an airy nature produce great confusion and commotion" (ὁτὲ δὲ τεταραγμέναι φαίνονται αἱ ὄψεις καὶ τερατώδεις, καὶ οὐκ εἰρόμενα τὰ ἐνύπνια, οἷον τοῖς μελαγχολικοῖς καὶ πυρέττουσι καὶ οἰνωμένοις· πάντα γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάθη πνευματώδη ὄντα πολλὴν ποιεῖ κίνησιν καὶ ταραχήν).

[4] In his speeches, Demosthenes "did not lead the citizens [of Athens] toward what was most pleasant, easiest, or most expedient, but in many places of his speech he thought that safety and security ought to be considered secondary to what is honorable and appropriate" (οὐ πρὸς τὸ ἥδιστον ἢ ῥᾷστον ἢ λυσιτελέστατον ἄγει ποὺς πολίτας, ἀλλὰ πολλαχοῦ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν καὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν οἴεται δεῖν ἐν δευτέρᾳ τάξει τοῦ καλοῦ ποιεῖσθαι καὶ τοῦ πρέποντος, *Demosthenes* 13.6). Plutarch describes these as honorable and noble aspirations (φιλοτιμία καὶ εὐγενεία).

Although the point is not obvious in Plato's dialogues, Irwin 2011, p. 246, argues that desire for honor is intended to play a similar role for Plato, at least insofar as rational calculation looks to self-interest: "This connection between the *kalon* and the spirited part is helpful, insofar as the spirited part is capable of being moved by motives that are not purely self-confined. Even if some course of action is advantageous to me, I may be deterred from it by the thought that it would involve shameful betrayal of my friends." Cf. Mossman 1999, pp. 88–9.

[5] While Demosthenes turns the Thebans to seek what he believes to be beneficial (συμφέρον) for both Athens and Thebes, his intervention is part of the chain of events leading to the defeat of Athens and Thebes at Chaeronea, to Thebes' great disadvantage in the future. On Plutarch's negative portrayal of Demosthenes and the lack of congruity between his rhetorical aspirations and actual effectiveness see Mossman 1999.

[T82] διὸ πρὸς τὸ ἀληθὲς ὁ λογισμός, ὅταν φανῇ, προέμενος τὸ ψεῦδος ἀσμένως ἀπέκλινεν· ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἐν ἑτέρῳ, τὸ πειθόμενον καὶ μεταπειθόμενον.

Therefore, reason gladly inclines toward what is true whenever it becomes apparent, letting go of what is false, since it is in reason and in nothing else that the faculty capable of being persuaded and of changing intention due to persuasion exists.
(Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 448A6–9)

The ability to be persuaded and to change one's mind due to arguments (τὸ πειθόμενον καὶ μεταπειθόμενον) belongs to reason and the rational part of the soul alone. Yet, as we see in *Demosthenes* above, this is not the only means of persuading others to change their intention.

In his biographical work on Pericles, Plutarch carves out a separate but parallel form of persuasion for emotions, described as an allurement or a leading of the soul (ψυχαγωγεῖν, ψυχαγωγία). In addition to rational means of persuasion, Pericles is able to manipulate the emotions of the Athenians, as though steering wild beasts, or turning their emotions like rudders:

[T83] οὐκέθ' ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν οὐδ' ὁμοίως χειροήθης τῷ δήμῳ καὶ ῥᾴδιος ὑπείκειν καὶ συνενδιδόναι ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, ὥσπερ πνοαῖς, τῶν πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἀνειμένης ἐκείνης καὶ ὑποθρυπτομένης ἔνια δημαγωγίας, ὥσπερ ἀνθηρᾶς καὶ μαλακῆς ἁρμονίας ἀριστοκρατικὴν καὶ βασιλικὴν ἐντεινάμενος πολιτείαν, καὶ χρώμενος αὐτῇ πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον ὀρθῇ καὶ ἀνεγκλίτῳ, τὰ μὲν πολλὰ βουλόμενον ἦγε πείθων καὶ διδάσκων τὸν δῆμον, ἦν δ' ὅτε καὶ μάλα δυσχεραίνοντα κατατείνων καὶ προσβιβάζων ἐχειροῦτο τῷ συμφέροντι, μιμούμενος ἀτεχνῶς ἰατρὸν ποικίλῳ νοσήματι καὶ μακρῷ κατὰ καιρὸν μὲν ἡδονὰς ἀβλαβεῖς, κατὰ καιρὸν δὲ δηγμοὺς καὶ φάρμακα προσφέροντα σωτήρια. παντοδαπῶν γὰρ ὡς εἰκὸς παθῶν ἐν ὄχλῳ τοσαύτην τὸ μέγεθος ἀρχὴν ἔχοντι φυομένων, μόνος ἐμμελῶς ἕκαστα διαχειρίσασθαι πεφυκώς, μάλιστα δ' ἐλπίσι καὶ φόβοις ὥσπερ οἴαξι συστέλλων τὸ θρασυνόμενον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ δύσθυμον ἀνιεὶς καὶ παραμυθούμενος, ἔδειξε τὴν ῥητορικὴν κατὰ Πλάτωνα (Phaedr. 271c) ψυχαγωγίαν οὖσαν καὶ μέγιστον ἔργον αὐτῆς τὴν περὶ τὰ ἤθη καὶ πάθη μέθοδον, ὥσπερ τινὰς τόνους καὶ φθόγγους ψυχῆς μάλ' ἐμμελοῦς ἁφῆς καὶ κρούσεως δεομένους.

No longer was he [Pericles] the same nor submissive in the same way toward the people, and he no longer readily yielded and gave in to the desires of the multitude, as though yielding to the winds, but from his former slack and sometimes nerveless leadership of the people, like a flowery and soft harmony, straining the pitch high to an aristocratic and monarchic administration and using it for what is best in a straight and unbending manner, he often led the people when they were willing by persuading and instructing them. There were other occasions, however, when they were especially vexed with him that he put them into submission, tightening the reins and pulling them to his purposes for

> what was beneficial, resembling, in truth, a doctor who supplies harmless pleasures on the right occasion and painful operations and drugs on other critical occasions to one who is sick with a complicated and chronic disease, using these treatments to cure the patient. For, while so many varied passions were growing, as is reasonable to expect in a crowd with an empire so great in power, he alone was equipped by nature to bring each of these passions into harmony, especially by using their hopes and fears like rudders, humbling their over-confidence and relieving and bringing encouragement against their despondency. In so doing, he demonstrated that the art of rhetoric, as Plato relates, "is a leading of the soul" [*Phaedrus* 271c10][6] and that its greatest work consists in the treatment of character and passions, as though these are pitches and sounds of the soul that are in great need of a harmonious touch or strike. (Plutarch, *Pericles* 15.1–2)[7]

Distinguishing two forms of persuasion, Plutarch first describes Pericles' use of rational persuasion (πείθειν). At times, Pericles led the people who were willing (βουλόμενοι)[8] by *persuading* them and *instructing* them (πείθων καὶ διδάσκων), i.e. using *arguments* aimed at changing their minds. This form of persuasion is unproblematic for the definition of persuasion in *On Moral Virtue* above (448A6–9=[T82]), since the instructions and arguments affect the rational part of the soul, which "*gladly* inclines toward what is true" (πρὸς τὸ ἀληθὲς ὁ λογισμός ἀσμένως ἀπέκλινεν).

The alternative form of persuasion becomes apparent when the people are belligerent and unyielding to Pericles. Pericles resorts to bending the will of the people by, as it were, drawing the reins taut and pulling the people in the direction he desires them to go. Like the charioteer in the *Phaedrus*, which we explored in previous chapters, Pericles directs the Athenians by guiding their passions, as though the Athenian populace were the horses of the chariot and the passionate parts of the soul writ large in the city.[9] He uses their passions, moreover, like rudders (ὥσπερ

---

[6] Plato, *Phaedrus* 271c10–d1: "Since the power of speech really is a leading of the soul, the one who intends to be an orator must know about the soul, how many kinds there are" (ἐπειδὴ λόγου δύναμις τυγχάνει ψυχαγωγία οὖσα, τὸν μέλλοντα ῥητορικὸν ἔσεσθαι ἀνάγκη εἰδέναι ψυχὴ ὅσα εἴδη ἔχει).

[7] Cf. Plutarch, *Phocion* 2.6–9.

[8] Plutarch need not be using βούλεσθαι to indicate *rational* desire (βούλησις), as we find it in Aristotle, but the choice of the term is suggestive. Cf. *Eudemian Ethics* 2.10, 1226b2–5 and 1227a3–5.

[9] Pericles here fits with the role that Plutarch assigns to the ruler in *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780B8–10: "The ruler must first establish rule within himself and make straight his own soul and make firm his character and then in the same way make what is subject to his rule [in the city] in harmony with his character" ([δεῖ, 780B5] παραπλησίως

οἴαξι), Plutarch writes, to steer them this way or that, toward the end that he sees to be in their best interest.[10] This, Plutarch emphasizes, reveals exactly what Plato meant when he called rhetoric the leading the soul (ψυχαγωγία), namely, a persuasion that uses emotions rather than rational arguments to lead and steer the soul in a different direction.[11]

Perhaps to avoid confusion and align his view with Platonic precedent, Plutarch distinguishes rational and emotional persuasion terminologically. One persuades (πείθειν) rationally through instruction and arguments, but leads the soul (ψυχαγωγεῖν) in the persuasion of non-rational passions.[12] The latter term is not only what we find in the *Phaedrus* used to

---

τὸν ἄρχοντα πρῶτον τὴν ἀρχὴν κτησάμενον ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ κατευθύναντα τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ καταστησάμενον τὸ ἦθος οὕτω συναρμόττειν τὸ ὑπήκοον). Plutarch likens Pericles as the leader of the city to the captain of the ship, and the people to the winds that toss it about, aligning the leader of the city with the rational part of the soul and his subjects to the spirited parts of the soul, as we find in the Wind in Our Sails passage of Chapter 3 (§II). The movement from the pattern of soul to the city itself mirrors the isomorphism of the City of Speech and soul in the *Republic*, but then Plutarch adds that the ruler, as the rational part of the city's, as it were, soul, is to imitate the divine ruler of the cosmos, the Demiurge (*To an Uneducated Ruler* 780D–E). Plutarch suggests this patterning of ruler as an imitation of god also in this passage on Pericles. The analogy to the musician should remind us of the Demiurge's role of taking pre-existing sounds and readjusting them to bring them into a harmonious blend in Plutarch's *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* (1014B6–C10). I take up these points further in Chapter 6, §II.

[10] On a similar use of the charioteer image together with the image of the captain of a ship steering the state see Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft* 801C13–F10. See also *Numa* 6.2–4, where Plutarch similarly likens the ruler of the city to a charioteer, guiding the people in their desires and impulses as though holding the reins of their passions in hand (τὴν ὁρμὴν αὐτῶν τρέπειν, διὰ χειρὸς ἔχοντα τὰς ἡνίας). Cf. Plato, *Critias* 108c, where persuasion is applied to the soul like a rudder.

[11] Plutarch faces a difficulty in assimilating Pericles' rhetorical persuasion to Platonic views of rhetoric. First, in Plato's works Pericles is portrayed negatively for failing to educate his own children and make them virtuous (*Protagoras* 319e–320a). Secondly, among the Platonic criticisms of rhetoric in the *Gorgias* there is a particular criticism leveled at Pericles that he corrupted the people by implementing jury pay (*Gorgias* 515e; cf. Plutarch, *Pericles* 9.1). Thirdly, Pericles is liable to Platonic criticisms of political rhetoric in the *Menexenus* (for which, see Monoson 1998). Plutarch's tactic, as Stadter 1989 (pp. xxxviii–xliv) notes, is to focus on *how* Pericles used his power to persuade and lead the people and *to what ends* to avoid the criticisms mentioned above. Plutarch assimilates Pericles' activity, to some extent, with the proper use of rhetoric, as outlined in Plato's *Phaedrus* (269c7–272b4; cf. Plutarch, *Pericles* 8.1 and 15.2), which both justifies Plutarch's use of Pericles as a fitting model for imitation in certain virtues while at the same time allowing Plutarch to discuss what he takes Plato to have intended as the use of persuasion of passions (ψυχαγωγία), namely to steer people back on the right course as though one stood as a proxy rational part for those who fail to be moved to do the right thing.

[12] Plutarch appears to maintain this distinction in *Bravery of Women* 243A9–B3, though he does not explicitly state what distinguishes these forms of persuasion there. While conviction through rational persuasion is no doubt preferable, as indicated in this passage, persuasion of passions is also able to be used to good ends.

On the role of persuasion in Plutarch's works see Stafford 1999, who discusses the Greek background to the cult of Persuasion and Plutarch's emphasis on the ambivalent nature of persuasion as a tool (ὄργανον) used for good or bad (Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft* 801C–802A, *Cicero* 4.5, *Fabius* 1.7, and *Pericles* 8.1), and the praise and blame possible for those who are persuaded easily or rightly, with particular emphasis on Plutarch's interest in the

describe the redirection of another by steering their emotions (271c10–d1), but it is also the term we found in the *Timaeus* for the persuasion of the appetitive part of the soul through imagistic representations (ψυχαγωγεῖσθαι, 71a3–7=[A10]), where the appetitive part of the soul lacks the capacity to be persuaded by rational arguments (§A.III.–§A.IV. in the Appendix to Chapter 4), but nonetheless is persuaded in a non-rational way.[13]

Before ending this section, I would like to discuss one more passage from Plutarch's works that brings to the fore the importance and usefulness of persuading others through a sense of shame and honor. Suppose that someone is dead set on an a course of destruction, folly, or disgrace; their mind may be deaf to all arguments intended to direct them in a better direction. In *Bravery of Women*, Plutarch discusses a case of this kind with an anecdote in which young women of Miletus suddenly, without obvious reason, begin to commit suicide *en masse* (249B3–C11).[14] Sneaking past their parents and guardians, they hang themselves. They cannot be averted from their intention to bring about their own deaths until one man comes to an ingenious solution: the bodies of all women who hang themselves should be carried through the marketplace nude. If they did not fear death and suffering, they would nonetheless fear the

---

good use of persuasion in marriage. See Gorgias' description of persuasion *molding* the soul of the listener however one wishes (τὴν ψυχὴν ἐτυπώσατο ὅπως ἐβούλετο) in *Encomium to Helen* 13. Cf. also Pelling 2014, p. 155. For an analysis of Plutarch's use of rhetorical strategies in *Dialogue on Love* 13–18 see Russell 1997.

[13] Cf. also Aristotle, *Poetics* 6, 1450a33–5: Tragedy has its greatest effect on the soul (τὰ μέγιστα οἷς ψυχαγωγεῖ) through reversals of fortune and discoveries, which are parts of the plot, i.e. these elements of the plot have their greatest effect on human emotion. This is the only use of ψυχαγωγία / ψυχαγωγεῖν in Aristotle's extant corpus. Emotions for Aristotle can, of course, be used to alter judgments (*Rhetoric* 2.1, 1378a20–3), since things can be made to appear differently due to emotion (1377b30; cf. *On Dreams* 460b1–16). Since Plutarch is in dialogue with Plato and drawing heavily on the notion of spirited emotions being used to guide behavior, I have focused on the Platonic background. The Aristotelian notions of emotional persuasion and Plutarch's relationship to them deserve a longer discussion outside the scope of this chapter. On the importance of altering judgment through emotion in Aristotle's rhetoric, see Fortenbaugh 1975 (esp. pp. 9–22), 2006 (esp. pp. 9–38), and the collection in Rorty 1996 (*Essays on Aristotle's* Rhetoric). Cf. especially Carey 1996, Leighton 1996, and Nussbaum 1996 (which overlaps with Ch. 3 in Nussbaum 1994) in that collection. On the role of emotional appeal in moral reform both in Plato's works (*Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*) and Aristotle's *Rhetoric* cf. Klosko 1993. On the development of rhetoric in ancient Greece, cf. also Kennedy 1963.

[14] Cf. Aulus Gellius 15.10=Sandbach fr. 175, who also relates the story from Plutarch's lost work *On the Soul*.

shame attached to the spectacle of their naked corpses borne through public places.[15] The solution works with complete success, entirely halting the girls from bringing about their own deaths (παντελῶς ἔπαυσε θανατώσας τὰς παρθένους, 249C6–7).

In explanation of the great effectiveness of this solution, Plutarch remarks that although arguments and tears (λόγοι καὶ δάκρυα) were unable to abate the girls' desire to hang themselves, which seemed to be a god-inflicted evil (κακὸν δαιμόνιον, 249C2),[16] a sense of shame overcame this desire:

[T84] μέγα δὴ τεκμήριον εὐφυΐας καὶ ἀρετῆς ἡ τῆς ἀδοξίας εὐλάβεια καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὰ δεινότατα τῶν ὄντων, θάνατον καὶ πόνον, ἀδεῶς ἐχούσας αἰσχροῦ φαντασίαν μὴ ὑπομεῖναι μηδ' ἐνεγκεῖν αἰσχύνην μετὰ θάνατον ἐσομένην.

> And, in fact, a great proof of natural goodness of growth and of virtue is the caution taken against ill-repute and the fact that those women, who were not afraid of the most dreadful of things, death and suffering, could not endure the appearance of something shameful nor could they bear the shame that they would have after death.
>
> (Plutarch, *Bravery of Women* 249C7–11)

The solution that halted the epidemic of mass suicide relied on the manipulation of the spirited passion of shame. The young women, whose minds were not changed by rational arguments (λόγοι) or deterred by the prospects of pain and death, were persuaded by the representation of the great shame (αἰσχροῦ φαντασία) they would inflict on their post-mortem reputation if they were to go through with their original intentions.[17] Passion, appealed to through the

[15] The shame of exposing one's naked body publicly need not always fall upon the one exposed. Plutarch gives two examples in which mothers expose their naked bodies to heap shame upon their sons as they attempt to flee from battle, and effectively weaponize female nudity against their kin (*Sayings of the Spartans* 241B1–4; *Bravery of Women* 246A1–B1). For a similar scene see *Bravery of Women* 248B. For the weaponization of female nudity cf. Håland 2011, pp. 16–17. On Plutarch's treatment of women in general see Le Corsu 1981.

[16] "The evil seemed to be of divine origin" (τὸ κακὸν ἐδόκει δαιμόνιον εἶναι).

[17] Cf. Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 18.1: As another example that the fear of shame can be greater than the fear of death, Plutarch also mentions a Spartan boy who conceals a stolen fox under his cloak, enduring the excruciating pain of his own disembowelment by the fox, lest he be caught stealing and endure the shame of being caught.

representation of prospective shame (αἰσχύνη), redirected their actions away from error even when reason failed.[18]

Just as in the other examples we have seen in this section, the spirited part of the soul's sensitivity to honor and shame serves as an additional system to which one can appeal in order to turn the soul in the right direction. Where the arguments and heartfelt appeals of our loved ones fail to move us, there is nonetheless a natural capacity for virtue and goodness within our nature that remains ready to respond to a sense of honor and shame. This passionate aspect of the soul is vitally useful in certain circumstances, such as when individuals are out of their wits or unable to be moved through rational persuasion.[19]

It is nonetheless ambivalent, since it can be used to manipulate others to bad ends as well as good. If our sensitivity to shame is not well-grounded, we can be easily led into error

---

[18] In *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance*, Plutarch describes an afterlife scenario in which those who lived a life of vice have their vice revealed, put to shameful display, naked (γυμνός) before the sight of the souls of their ancestors and descendants (565A8–67E3). The pain of one's own vice and ill-repute, moreover, lives on after one's earthly life and brings pain and punishment even upon the souls of one's children and descendants (εἴς τινας ἐκγόνους ἢ παῖδας ἡ ποινὴ περιῆλθεν, 567D3–6). Upon entering the afterlife, the souls of one's descendants, in turn, condemn and torture the souls of their ancestors for bringing pain and shame to themselves (567D6–E3). According to this view of the afterlife, our actions and reputation have a profound effect on our descendants and can have an effect on our own post-mortem happiness or misery. For more on Greek views of how we affect others in the afterlife and are affected by our descendants cf. Pritzl 1983, Gooch 1983 and Dubois 2014, who discuss how reputation and happiness are affected after death in wider Greek culture, though they focus more specifically on Aristotle's comments in *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.10–11.

[19] Plutarch also uses several Homeric examples to demonstrate the point. In *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 74B5–9, Plutarch follows the example of Odysseus chiding Achilles with the more general remark that "Therefore in the spirited and manly individual by the representation of cowardice… [those who chide others] rouse an impulse toward noble things and drive him away from things that are shameful" (τὸν μὲν οὖν θυμοειδῆ καὶ ἀνδρώδη δειλίας δόξῃ…παροῤμῶσι πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ τῶν αἰσχρῶν ἀπελαύνουσι). In *On How a Young Man Should Study Poetry* 27A3–6, Meleager is given as an example of one who is correctly criticized for being swept away into folly through his anger but then praised for being brought back to do what is honorable and beneficial (καλὸν καὶ συμφέρον), changing his mind (μετανοεῖν). In the context of the passage from *Iliad* 9, which Plutarch does not provide, Meleager, like the women of Miletus, is not persuaded by arguments or tears from family or his fellow citizens (*Iliad* 9.574–89), but instead is persuaded by the fear of *greater* shame and disgraceful consequences that will befall him, his family, and his city if he does not change his mind. Meleager's wife effectively provokes his spirited passion (θυμός, 595) to action in a more beneficial direction by invoking the prospect of great dishonor and shame. In close connection, Plutarch also analyzes Phoenix's change of intention (μετανοεῖν) in what is sometimes printed as *Iliad* 9.458–61, lines which are not present in any MS of Homer, but which Plutarch claims Aristarchus excised without seeing their appropriateness (*On How a Young Man Should Study Poetry* 26F3–27A2). In those lines, Phoenix explains that the prospect of shame and the rumors of men cause him to change his intention from what he had decided to do in anger.

(Plutarch, *Timoleon* 6.1–7), as I will discuss further in §VI. We can be tossed about, like a ship without an anchor (Plutarch, *To an Uneducated Ruler* 782D7–E10; *On the Control of Anger* 460A10–B10).

Plutarch, however, makes a more general and significant claim here in [T84] that will be important for §II and the next chapter. Built into our constitution is not only a capacity to be formed in our rational minds, but also a natural aptitude to be formed in our passionate nature: the natural goodness for growth and development (εὐφυΐα) and virtue (ἀρετή) is evidenced in our desire to pursue what is honorable and avoid what is shameful, passions belonging to the spirited part of the soul.[20] This, Plutarch emphasizes, is proof (τεκμήριον) of a natural propensity for virtue and an inherent disposition to become good.

§II Correcting Xenocrates on Education and the "Grips of Philosophy"

Following upon the last section, Plutarch considers the natural goodness for growth and development toward virtue (εὐφυΐα) vital to the formation of human character, since the education of one's spirited passions sets one's foot, as it were, on the first step down the path to virtue. Because moral virtues require the harmonization of passions with reason,[21] and because

[20] On εὐφυΐα as a potential to grow toward virtue in Plutarch see *Table-Talk* 636B2–6, *How a Young Man Should Read Poetry* 26A4–B2, *Dialogue on Love* 767B3–4, *Cimon* 5.6, *Marcus Cato* 20.9, *Alcibiades* 4.1, *Galba* 23.2, *Aratus* 10.5, and Stob. 1.44.60=Sandbach fr. 200. I pick up on this notion further in Chapter 6. The term never occurs in Plato's works. Among the Stoics, this sense of potential to grow toward virtue is also frequent, for which see Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1073B10–11=*SVF* 3.719; *SVF* 3.366; *SVF* 3.135; D.L. 7.106=*SVF* 3.127; D.L. 7.107=LS59m; D.L.7.129=*SVF* 3.716; Stob. 2.7.7b (p. 80, l. 22–p. 81, l. 6)=*SVF* 3.136. For the Stoics, this potential is *rational* in nature (cf. Inwood and Donini 1999, pp. 724–36), while in Plutarch, as we will see below and in Chapter 6, it is in the *passions*. Aristotle in several instances uses the term to indicate a natural endowment of a rational capacity, such as moral vision (*Nicomachean Ethics* 3.17–18, 1114b6–12), the ability to create metaphor (*Poetics* 22, 1249a4–8), and the natural ability to choose what is true over what it false (*Topics* 8.14, 163b12–15). Cf. also *Nicomachean Ethics* 6.1 and 10.3. On the potential for passions to grow into excellence see Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics* 8.2, 1247b33–1248a1. In later Platonists, such as Alcinous (*Handbook* 152.14–29 and 183.17–27), Arius Didymus (Stob. 2.7.18 (p. 131, ll. 14–19)), and the Anonymous Commentator on the *Theaetetus* (4.46–5.3, 4.27–5.3, and 11.12–13.12), it indicates potential to grow toward virtue. Cf. Whittaker's Budé edition of Alcinous (1990), p. 2, n. 15; p. 144, n. 487. Cf. also Gill 1983b, p. 469 and n. 5.

[21] *On Moral Virtue* 444C6–D1, 444E9–445A2, 449F2–4; *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008E3–1009B2; *On Moral Progress* 84A5–10. See §V–§VII in Chapter 2.

Plutarch holds passions to be strong and malleable at early stages of development *before* reason is strong in humans,[22] he also deems the initial stages of one's upbringing the most critical time for setting the direction of one's life either on the path to virtue or toward corruption and vice (§II.a.).[23] The reasons why Plutarch holds our early education of passions to be so important are twofold. First, these passions, particularly spirited emotions concerned with shame and honor, can build up resistance to becoming allied to reason later in life due to corrupt upbringing (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 442B4–C5 and *On Being a Busybody* 522E6–9).[24] Nurses, tutors, parents, and instructors must do their part to shape one's passionate nature so that it is amenable to moral development while they are impressionable and before they are self-reliant (§II.b.).[25] Secondly, our passionate nature has a strong role in guiding the behavior of children before they are more autonomous and self-governing rational beings (*On Listening to Lectures* 37D11–E3).[26] Spirited emotions thus play a mediating role between infancy and adulthood, guiding our orientation to what is honorable or shameful as we begin to make good choices for ourselves without the constant oversight and direction of others (§II.c.).

---

[22] See §II and §VII and n. 26 in Chapter 4. The claim that we are not endowed with our full rational powers does not imply that we have no rational part of the soul whatsoever from early infancy. See nn. 25 and 39 below.

[23] *On Moral Virtue* 452D8–12.

[24] See n. 41 below.

[25] The stages of childhood education that Plutarch generally follows are described in both Plato's *Laws* and *Protagoras*. In *Laws* 7, 808d1–e4, the progression moves from mothers and nurses to tutors and then instructors: Just as sheep must not be allowed to live apart from a shepherd, when they leave their mothers and nurses (τροφῶν καὶ μητέρων ὅταν ἀπαλλάττηται), young children should not be without tutors (ἄνευ ποιμένος δὲ οὔτε πρόβατα οὔτ' ἄλλο οὐδέν πω βιωτέον, οὐδὲ δὴ παῖδας ἄνευ τινῶν παιδαγωγῶν), who serve as bridles to constrain their actions and possible deviant impulses, as they have a font of thought that is not yet mature (ἔχει πηγὴν τοῦ φρονεῖν μήπω κατηρτυμένην). After this, the next stage involves training under teachers (διδάσκαλοι). A similar account is given in Plato, *Protagoras* 325c5–a4: Earliest education is under one's parents and nurses, then tutors. Children are thereafter sent to school-houses for grammar instruction before being sent to teachers of poetry. For a partial quotation of this text see n. 52 below.

On the stages of general education, see Marrou 1956 for an overview of educational curricula outlined from Homer to Classical Christian education. On the stages of childhood education through adulthood in Plutarch, with focus on both Plutarch's *Moralia* and *Lives*, see Xenophontos 2016, esp. pp. 42–107.

[26] One's progression from childhood to manhood (εἰς ἄνδρας ἐκ παίδων ἀγωγή) is not a casting off of rule within the soul (οὐκ ἀρχῆς ἀποβολή), but rather a change in what is ruling within the soul (μεταβολὴ ἄρχοντος), as one becomes self-governing through reason, which one receives as the divine element set to rule within (θεῖον ἡγεμόνα τοῦ βίου λαμβάνουσι τὸν λόγον).

§II.a. The Grips of Philosophy as Preparation for Progress in Virtue

To emphasize the importance of the early formation of our passionate nature for making progress in virtue, Plutarch borrows and repurposes Xenocrates' metaphor of the "grips of philosophy" (λαβαὶ φιλοσοφίας). Xenocrates, according to the anecdote alluded to by Plutarch and given with variation by Diogenes Laertius, Stobaeus, and preserved in other fragments,[27] considered education in discourse and the sciences to be the "grips of philosophy," by which he seems to mean primarily *preparation* for advancement in philosophy and virtue.

In the anecdote, Xenocrates turns away a potential disciple in philosophical dialectic on the grounds that he has not come fit to receive further education. The young man lacks the "grips of philosophy," which Xenocrates identifies as the precursory education in music, geometry, and astronomy,[28] following the *Republic*'s description of preliminary education (προπαιδεία) that precedes the study of dialectic (ἠν τῆς διαλεκτικῆς δεῖ προπαιδευθῆναι, 7, 536d4–7).[29] Xenocrates thus treats the young man as unprepared for advancement in philosophy as it is

[27] See the following note.

[28] D.L. 4.10=fr. 2.53–7 Parente: "To one who had not learned music, geometry, and astronomy, but who wished to study with him [Xenocrates] said, 'Go, since you do not have the grips of philosophy.' Others say that he said this: 'since fleece is not carded at my house'" (πρός τε τὸν μήτε μουσικὴν μήτε γεωμετρικὴν μήτε ἀστρονομίαν μεμαθηκότα, βουλόμενον δὲ παρ' αὐτὸν φοιτᾶν, "πορεύου," ἔφη· "λαβὰς γὰρ οὐκ ἔχεις φιλοσοφίας." οἱ δὲ τοῦτό φασιν εἰπεῖν, "παρ' ἐμοὶ γὰρ πόκος οὐ κνάπτεται"). Stob. 2.31.111=fr. 57 Parente: "Xenocrates, whenever a certain person, who had not a portion of general education, desired to devote himself to him, said 'Go away. You do not have the grips for philosophy, since it is necessary for one to be pre-softened by these studies in his soul'" (Ξενοκράτης, ὁπότε τις αὐτῷ σχολάζειν ἤθελεν οὐδενὸς τῶν ἐγκυκλίων μαθημάτων μετειληφώς· "ἄπιθι, εἶπε, λαβὰς οὐκ ἔχεις πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν· δεῖ γὰρ προμεμαλάχθαι διὰ τούτων τὴν ψυχήν"). Cf. fr. 58 Parente: "For Xenocrates asked a young man who desired to do philosophy with him whether he had learned geometry and whether he had taken in music. When he said he had not, Xenocrates bade him to go back from where he came, since he did not have the grips of philosophy" (ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ξενοκράτης ἐρόμενος τὸν παρ' αὐτῷ φιλοσοφεῖν νέον βουλόμενον εἰ γεγεωμέτρηκεν, εἰ μουσικῆς ἀπακήκοεν, ὡς οὐκ ἔφη, ἀπέναι πάλιν αὐτὸν ἐκέλευσεν, οὐκ ἔχειν γὰρ λαβὰς πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν); fr. 59 Parente: "They say that Xenocrates the philosopher, when a certain unlearned person wished to philosophize, said to him, 'Go away since you do not have the grips, i.e. ears'" (Ξενοκράτην δὲ τὸν φιλόσοφον λέγουσι βουλομένου τινὸς ἀγραμματικεύτου φιλοσοφεῖν εἰπεῖν· "ἄπιθι· λαβὰς γὰρ οὐδὲ ὦτα ἔχεις").

[29] "Therefore, we ought to introduced to children the elements of calculation, geometry, and all of the preliminary education *that they must have been educated in before dialectic* without making the entire schema of their education something forced" (τὰ μὲν τοίνυν λογισμῶν τε καὶ γεωμετριῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς προπαιδείας, ἣν τῆς διαλεκτικῆς δεῖ προπαιδευθῆναι, παισὶν οὖσι χρὴ προβάλλειν, οὐχ ὡς ἐπάναγκες μαθεῖν τὸ σχῆμα τῆς διδαχῆς ποιουμένους).

outlined for those who are to become philosophic rulers in the *Republic* (7, 521d13–40c2).

The "grips" (λαβαί) of philosophy for Xenocrates, then, are the point at which philosophy is first able to *take hold* (λαβεῖν). In one version of the anecdote, the young man's lack of education means that he has not been "pre-softened" (προμεμαλάχθαι) by these studies (Stob. 2.31.111). In another, his fleece, as it were, has not been carded already and prepared (D.L. 4.10).[30] There is no pre-existing state or disposition of soul that has been made ready for modification by virtue, a preparation in which philosophy can "take hold."

Plutarch also takes "grip" in this sense of preparation and as the first point at which philosophy gets a grip on the soul,[31] but he disagrees with Xenocrates on what constitutes the grips for philosophy and progress:

[T85] οὐ γὰρ οὕτως τὰ μαθήματα φαίη τις ἄν, ὡς ἔλεγε Ξενοκράτης, λαβὰς εἶναι φιλοσοφίας, ὡς τὰ πάθη τῶν νέων, αἰσχύνην ἐπιθυμίαν μετάνοιαν ἡδονὴν λύπην φιλοτιμίαν· ὧν ἐμμελῆ καὶ σωτήριον ἁφὴν ἁπτόμενος ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ νόμος εἰς τὴν προσήκουσαν ὁδὸν ἀνυσίμως καθίστησι τὸν νέον.

> For someone would not so much call our studies the "grips of philosophy," as Xenocrates said, so much as the passions of the young, namely, shame, desire, repentance, pleasure, pain, and love of honor, which, if reason and the law get a suitable and secure grasp of, set the young man on a fitting path to great effect. (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 452D3–8)

Plutarch moves the emphasis in education from the rational studies that precede philosophical dialectic in Plato's *Republic* to the habituation of pleasure, pain, and the passions that belong to the non-rational part of the soul, drawing us back to the notion that we need to shape the nature of the young in pre-philosophical stages of life to make them amenable to receive further

[30] For the last two citations, see n. 28 above.

[31] The notion of a grip or handle (λαβή) that Plutarch gives can indicate any number of functions, such as the handle of a sword (Alcaeus 33.2; cf. Demosthenes 27.20) or a cup (Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 473; cf. Aristophanes, *Peace* 1258), a place that one can grab (Plutarch, *Theseus* 5.4), or an opportunity that one can put one's hand to metaphorically. In the dialogues, Plato uses λαβή variously as a "hold," as in a metaphorical wrestling bout between interlocutors (ὥσπερ παλαιστής, *Republic* 8, 544b5; *Phaedrus* 236b8; cf. Plutarch, *Eumenes* 7.10), and as the starting point in "getting a hold" on an argument (*Laws* 3, 682e10–11: "The argument, as it were, provides a grip for us" (καὶ ὁ λόγος ἡμῖν οἷον λαβὴν ἀποδίδωσιν) to make a fresh start. Cf. Plutarch, *Cicero* 20.6: "he gave no hold for a conviction" (λαβὴν δ' οὐδεμίαν εἰς ἔλεγχον παρέδωκεν)).

education later in life. But, that shaping will predominantly take the form of habituating passions so that the young feel pleasure in what is correct and shame and disgust for what is wrong, i.e. the spirited emotions associated with honor and shame (*Republic* 2, 375a2–3; 4, 414a6). The preparatory education (προπαιδεία) that is of greatest importance, then, is not found in the sciences, Plutarch argues, but in the *habits* one has developed in one's passionate nature much earlier in one's life.

Moral virtue for Plutarch is not simply knowledge.[32] Nor is virtue merely having a well-stocked set of concepts about what is appropriate or being informed through higher education and philosophy, as though learning these concepts will automatically bring one's passionate nature into harmony with one's rational convictions.[33] Even if we are well-informed in the rational part of our soul, our passions can oppose and operate independently of our rational judgments (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 448B3–9 and 449B11–C3[34]). Additionally, passions are not particularly well suited to respond to formation through rational instruction.[35] Moral virtue is produced within passions, however, when they are brought into harmony with reason and into proper limits.[36]

To shape the passionate nature, Plutarch argues that the most effective education lies in

---

[32] Socrates is sometimes thought to have held that virtue is knowledge or rather that knowledge of virtue is sufficient to make one virtuous. Proponents of this view often draw upon Plato's *Meno* and *Protagoras*. Cf. Pangle 2014 for a recent defense of this position. For a succinct history of the view and its relation to Plato's view of virtue cf. Vasilou 2014. I take Plutarch's position to be closer to what Yong 1996 sees in Plato's theory of ethical education, who argues that knowledge is not sufficient for someone to become good, since moral habituation is as basic an element to Plato's theory on how one becomes good as is ethical theorizing, and is, in fact, prior (see esp. pp. 54–8).

[33] For the Stoics, a soul is virtuous depending on the state of the commanding-faculty and reason within it, which, according to Chrysippus, "is a collection of certain conceptions and preconceptions" (ἔστιν ἐννοιῶν τέ τινων καὶ προλήψεων ἄθροισμα, Galen, *On Hippocrates' and Plato's Doctrines* 5.2.49 and 5.3.1=LS 53V=*SVF* 2.841). Perfected reason for the Stoics is virtue (*ratio perfecta virtus vocatur*, Seneca, *Epistles* 76.9–10=LS 63D=*SVF* 3.200a).

[34] =[T65] in Chapter 4.

[35] See §I and §V in Chapter 4.

[36] Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 444C6–D1, 444E9–445A2, 449F2–4; *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008E3–1009B2; *On Moral Progress* 84A5–10.

habituation (ἐθισμός, ἐθίζειν). All passions, Plutarch writes, require habituation (πάντων δὲ τῶν παθῶν ἐθισμοῦ δεομένων, Plutarch, *On the Control of Anger* 459B3–5[37]), and the earlier one begins to shape habits, the better (πόρρωθεν ἀρξάμενοι, *On Being a Busybody* 520D3–7[38]). Drawing on the *Republic*'s metaphor of molding character (2, 377c3–6), Plutarch goes so far as to call the formation of our earliest habits the first *step* we take on the path to virtue:

[T86] πρῶτοι γὰρ οὗτοι [οἱ παιδαγωγοὶ, 439F2] παραλαμβάνοντες ἐκ γάλακτος, ὥσπερ αἱ τίτθαι ταῖς χερσὶ τὸ σῶμα πλάττουσιν, οὕτω τὸ ἦθος ῥυθμίζουσι τοῖς ἔθεσιν εἰς ἴχνος τι πρῶτον ἀρετῆς καθιστάντες.

> For these [tutors], receiving [the children] first from when they are weaned, bring their character into good measure through habits, just as nurses mold the body with their hands, setting them to take their first footstep on the path to virtue.
> (Plutarch, *Can Virtue be Taught* 439F2–5)[39]

To do this, tutors, just as nurses before them, shape and mold the passions into habits not so much by rational instruction, but by harmonizing (ῥυθμίζειν) children's passionate character to be in conformity with reason. They bring their passions into alignment with evaluations, the

---

[37] "All passions need habituation, since habituation, as it were, subdues and masters the non-rational, disobedient part of the soul through practice" (πάντων δὲ τῶν παθῶν ἐθισμοῦ δεομένων οἷον δαμάζοντος καὶ καταθλοῦντος ἀσκήσει τὸ ἄλογον καὶ δυσπειθές).

[38] "The greatest means for averting excessive passion is habituation, if beginning from far away we train ourselves and teach ourselves for this self-mastery. For the increase of the diseased state came about through habit, moving forward little by little" (μέγιστον μέντοι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πάθους ἀποτροπὴν ὁ ἐθισμός, ἐὰν πόρρωθεν ἀρξάμενοι γυμνάζωμεν ἑαυτοὺς καὶ διδάσκωμεν ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐγκράτειαν· καὶ γὰρ ἡ αὔξησις ἔθει γέγονε, τοῦ νοσήματος κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς τὸ πρόσω χωροῦντος). In this passage, Plutarch describes self-directed training and habituation, but I take it that the sentiment is also applicable to training others from as early as one can in forming correct habits. Hence, as we will see, Plutarch declares early education, i.e. habituation, of passions to be the most important aspect in training the young to be virtuous, since it sets a firm foundation for later development.

[39] Cf. *On Moral Virtue* 452D7–8: "If reason and the law take hold of the passions with a harmonious and salvific grip, they efficaciously set the young man on a fitting path" (ὧν ἐμμελῆ καὶ σωτήριον ἁφὴν ἁπτόμενος ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ νόμος εἰς τὴν προσήκουσαν ὁδὸν ἀνυσίμως καθίστησι τὸν νέον). While the non-rational passions, once properly habituated, set us on the right path, reason and instruction come from outside to direct the course and give course correction. For the Platonic image and reference to nurses shaping the limbs and character of the young cf. also Pseudo-Plutarch, *On the Education of Children* 3E2–F7: We ought to bring the character of children into harmony from the beginning of their life (τὰ τῶν τέκνων ἤθη ῥυθμίζειν προσήκει), just as nurses shape their limbs straight from the womb. The period of life in one's youth is very plastic and soft (εὔπλαστον γὰρ καὶ ὑγρὸν ὁ νεότης, 3e6–7) and the impressions made upon children's minds become hard to remove later. Plato thus recommended that nurses guard against stories of just any sort so that they should not happen to be filled with foolishness and corruption in their souls from the start. On the spurious attribution of *On the Education of Children* (*De liberis educandis* (*Περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς*)) to Plutarch see Wyttenbach 6.1, pp. 29–64. Cf. also Sirinelli 1987, pp. 25–26.

justification of which they cannot yet understand, but which they will hopefully come to appreciate later as their rational powers mature.[40]

The attunement of one's passionate dispositions is possible because of the nature of spirited emotions. The spirited part of the soul has certain basic favorable and unfavorable attitudes to somewhat abstract notions of what is honorable and ignoble. Spirited emotions, that is, exhibit complex cognitive features that are naturally programmed to evaluate desires and actions as honorable, to-be-pursued and shameful, to-be-avoided. But, what falls into these evaluative classes is also subject to modification through our upbringing.

Our natural desire and aversion for certain objects that fit into those opposing evaluative classes of what is honorable or shameful can err (*On Listening to Lectures* 38C4–D6). They can also become corrupted (*On Moral Virtue* 442B4–C5).[41] The educator's task, then, is to give a generally well-oriented sense of shame, desire for honor, and disgust for what is shameful through habituation, inculcating the right evaluative standards into the passionate emotions of children.

§II.b. The Grips of Philosophy as Oar-Handles

To attune these spirited emotions, Plutarch does not turn to rational discourse as the primary means of shaping spirited emotions. Where passions can be deaf to reason, they are,

[40] See Chapter 4, n. 28.
[41] The affective part of the soul (τὸ παθητικόν), which stands for the spirited part here, "naturally takes heed of the rational and thinking part of the soul, turns toward it, submits to it, and conforms to it, if it has not been completely corrupted by witless pleasure and an indulgent lifestyle" (τοῦ λογιζομένου καὶ φρονοῦντος εἰσακούειν καὶ τρέπεσθαι πρὸς ἐκεῖνο καὶ ὑπείκειν καὶ κατασχηματίζεσθαι πέφυκεν, ἐὰν μὴ τέλεον ᾖ διεφθαρμένον ὑφ' ἡδονῆς ἀμαθοῦς καὶ ἀκολάστου διαίτης). This quotation is part of [T66] in Chapter 4. On τὸ παθητικόν as the spirited part of the soul here cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 441a2–3.

especially early on, responsive to pleasure and pain.[42] The same is true of children whose cognitive capacities are also in their infancy, but whose passions are strong from birth.[43]

Plutarch instead describes the use of a more rudimentary system to shape spirited emotions: the tutor trains children to feel *pleasure* in what is honorable and *pain* in what is shameful:

[T87] μὴ κακῶς εἰπεῖν τὸν Λάκωνα παιδαγωγόν, ὅτι ποιήσει τὸν παῖδα τοῖς καλοῖς ἥδεσθαι καὶ ἄχθεσθαι τοῖς αἰσχροῖς, οὗ μεῖζον οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδὲ κάλλιον ἀποφῆναι τέλος ἐλευθέρῳ προσηκούσης παιδείας.

> The Spartan tutor was not wrong to say that he would make a child take pleasure in what is honorable and be grieved by what is dishonorable. There is no end of education fitting to a free-born youth that is greater or more noble than this.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 452D8–12)

[42] As in the Myth of the Charioteer metaphor, the deaf horse representative of the appetitive part of the soul does not understand honor and shame, but responds only to pleasure and pain (Plato, *Phaedrus* 254e5). Cf. Yunis *ad loc*.: Physical pain is "the only language it understands." While the spirited part has a greater capacity to listen to reason than the appetitive, as we saw in Chapter 4, it nonetheless is less sophisticated than the rational part of the soul.

[43] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 441a7–b1; *Laws* 2, 653a5–6 and *Protagoras* 325d5–7. Cf. also Aristotle *Rhetoric* 2.6, 1383b12–15, and 1384a22; *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.3, 1104b30–1105a3, and 10.9, 1179b28–9. In *Rhetoric* 2.6, shame is experienced as something negative and to be avoided because it is represented as painful: "Let shame be a certain pain or disturbance about what appears to bring one to bad reputation of evil deeds that are present, have already happened, or will happen in the future, and let shamelessness be a certain disdain and lack of feeling about these same things" (ἔστω δὴ αἰσχύνη λύπη τις ἢ ταραχὴ περὶ τὰ εἰς ἀδοξίαν φαινόμενα φέρειν τῶν κακῶν, ἢ παρόντων ἢ γεγονότων ἢ μελλόντων, ἡ δ' ἀναισχυντία ὀλιγωρία τις καὶ ἀπάθεια περὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ταῦτα). In *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.3, Aristotle describes our attraction as under the guise of three separate categories: the pleasant, the honorable, and the good. Conversely, we are averse to the painful, the shameful, and the bad: "Since there are three things that move us toward choice or avoidance, namely, what is noble, beneficial, or pleasant, and their opposites, namely, what is shameful, harmful, or painful, the good man will be correct in his action and the vicious man erring in his action concerning all these things, especially concerning pleasure, since this is shared with the animals and follows closely all things under our choice. And indeed, what is noble and what is beneficial are represented as pleasant. And moreover, from infancy our sense of pleasure has been bred up and nurtured with all of us as a familiar. For this reason, it is hard to get rid of this passion since it has been ingrained in our life" (τριῶν γὰρ ὄντων τῶν εἰς τὰς αἱρέσεις καὶ τριῶν τῶν εἰς τὰς φυγάς, καλοῦ συμφέροντος ἡδέος, καὶ [τριῶν] τῶν ἐναντίων, αἰσχροῦ βλαβεροῦ λυπηροῦ, περὶ ταῦτα μὲν πάντα ὁ ἀγαθὸς κατορθωτικός ἐστιν ὁ δὲ κακὸς ἁμαρτητικός, μάλιστα δὲ περὶ τὴν ἡδονήν· κοινή τε γὰρ αὕτη τοῖς ζῴοις, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν αἵρεσιν παρακολουθεῖ· καὶ γὰρ τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ συμφέρον ἡδὺ φαίνεται. ἔτι δ' ἐκ νηπίου πᾶσιν ἡμῖν συντέθραπται· διὸ χαλεπὸν ἀποτρίψασθαι τοῦτο τὸ πάθος ἐγκεχρωσμένον τῷ βίῳ, 2.3, 1104b30–1105a3). Passion, which is present in the young, often yields more to force and pain than to rational persuasion, as Aristotle writes in 10.9, 1179b28–9.

Plutarch here describes a kind of calibration of spirited passions, drawing on a common trope of the effectiveness of Spartan rearing or training in habits ((ἀνα-)τροφή).[44] There are certain standards of what is shameful and honorable that children should come to internalize in their dispositions, a process in which Spartans claim particular expertise (*Can Virtue be Taught* 439F6[45] and *Lysander* 2.2[46]).[47] Taking what is honorable (τὰ καλά) in a normative sense, habituation is a prolonged process of making children associate positively with what they *should* pursue as honorable and associate negatively with what they *should* avoid as shameful.

This process of habituation takes constant major and minor readjustments, recalibrating children's passions little by little toward progress (κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς τὸ πρόσω, Plutarch, *On Being a Busybody* 520D3–7), until habitual acquaintance with what is honorable makes everything honorable also pleasant (τὴν πᾶν τὸ καλὸν ἡδὺ ποιοῦσαν… συνήθειαν, Plutarch, *On Listening to Lectures* 47C3–4).[48] Habituation thus initially involves solidifying *associations* of positive and negative valence, such as pleasurable and painful experiences, with certain types

[44] Spartan women were thought particularly good at training young children in their early passions and desires. We more frequently know the names of Spartan nurses than other household figures because of this. Cf. Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 1.2; Marrou 1956, pp. 19–20. Cf. also Powell 2015, pp. 93–102.

[45] "When asked what he provided by his teaching, the Spartan said, 'I make honorable things pleasant to children'" (καὶ ὁ Λάκων ἐρωτηθεὶς τί παρέχει παιδαγωγῶν, "τὰ καλά," ἔφη, "τοῖς παισὶν ἡδέα ποιῶ").

[46] "For they [the Spartans] wish for their children straightway from the beginning to be affected in some way with regard to reputation, feeling pain from censures and elation due to praises, and the man who is without passion and unmoved by these things is looked down upon as lacking in the love of honor for virtue and barren in relation to it. Thus his [Lysander's] love of honor and love of contest remained, brought about from his Spartan education, and one ought not to find any great fault with his nature in these things" (βούλονται γὰρ εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς πάσχειν τι τοὺς παῖδας αὐτῶν πρὸς δόξαν, ἀλγυνομένους τε τοῖς ψόγοις καὶ μεγαλυνομένους ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπαίνων· ὁ δὲ ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀκίνητος ἐν τούτοις ὡς ἀφιλότιμος πρὸς ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀργὸς καταφρονεῖται. τὸ μὲν οὖν φιλότιμον αὐτῷ καὶ φιλόνεικον ἐκ τῆς Λακωνικῆς παρέμεινε παιδείας ἐγγενόμενον, καὶ οὐδέν τι μέγα χρὴ τὴν φύσιν ἐν τούτοις αἰτιᾶσθαι).

[47] Cf. also Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.8, 1099a17–19; 1.13, 1102a7–15; 3.7, 1115b23; 3.9, 1117b1–17; 10.9, 1180a24–9. There is also a negative portrayal of this form of education. The Spartan system was sometimes criticized for going beyond preparatory and preliminary education, creating unquestioning obedience to the state. See Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 30.4. Cf. Marrou 1956, pp. 19–22.

[48] In line with Aristotle on this point, pleasure not only draws one to act in certain ways, but also increases one's drive to continue in the activity and to form a habituated disposition toward it (*Rhetoric* 1.11, 1370a5–9; *Nicomachean Ethics* 10.5, 1175a29–36; cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.3, 1105a3–7; 10.4, 1174b20–5; 10.5, 1175a34–b24). Cf. Sherman 1989, p. 184.

of actions through the spirited passions of honor and shame. And so, associating pain with certain types of activity helps to solidify a connection, especially as instructors continue to represent the actions and desires as shameful in conjunction with painful punishment and censure.[49] The path to virtue, becomes even smoother and easier as one continues to reinforce good habits through practice (*Progress in Virtue* 77D4–8).[50]

Children begin to see certain actions and desires as to-be-done or not-to-be-done, inculcating certain standards of judgment through habituation, not only due to corporal punishment, but also through the pleasures and pains of praise and blame (*On Moral Virtue* 452C6–D1[51]; *On Listening to Lectures* 46D4–13 and *On Compliancy* 528F1–4). They operate on

---

[49] Plutarch, like Plato, Aristotle, and the author of *On the Education of Children*, often uses a kind of "mechanical metaphor" to describe the habituation of passions, bending and twisting them into a certain shape, even as we see in the metaphor of shaping the passions of the young, as nurses shape and mold the limbs of infants (Plato, *Republic* 2, 377c3–6; Plutarch, *Can Virtue be Taught* 439F2–5=[T86]). Cf. *On the Education of Children* 2D1–10, which likens habituation to *bending* wood into chariot wheels so that the wood cannot be made straight again (cf. Plato, *Protagoras* 325c5–e1), the hollowing of rocks produced by small and consistent drops of water, and the wearing down of iron and bronze by touch over time. For the mechanical metaphor in Aristotle see Sorabji 1973, pp 201–19, and Burnyeat 1980, esp. pp. 73–4. Sherman 1989, pp. 157–87, focusing on Aristotle's theory of habituation, finds fault with this metaphor precisely because it neglects to explain the transition from early education of passions, when we are less cognitively capable, to the development of practical wisdom and discernment as we mature into the cultivators of our own passions. Cf. Russell 2014 and Jimenez 2015, for a similar view. Wilberding 2009, pp. 358–64 (cf. also Singpurwalla 2013, pp. 50–2; Jenkins 2015), raises a similar worry for Plato's description of early education and proposes that what is really educated in early habituation is not the passionate part of the soul, but instead proto-rational capacities.

One might worry that my own presentation of the education of passions through habituation is open to the same criticism, especially since in §II and §VII of Chapter 4, I stressed the *cognitive* aspect of inculcating standards of judgment through habituation (ἐθίζειν / ἐθισμός) as a form of learning (μανθάνειν) but here present a more rudimentary system of associating pleasure and pain with seeing things as honorable or shameful. To such an objection I can say that, while I emphasize in this section the rudimentary aspects of association, those associations are part of a process of inculcating standards that are representational and evaluative. Pleasure and pain are used to help calibrate positive and negative valence within the representational and evaluative capacities of the spirited part of the soul. While the methods used to attune spirited emotions to absorb correct standards of evaluation are simple, the emotions are still complex in their content. While I focus on shaping spirited emotions here, even early education will begin a process of informing the rational part of the soul with correct beliefs. See §IV below.

[50] "The most ancient evidence of progress from Hesiod, namely, that the path no longer is uphill nor extremely steep, but is easy, smooth, and easily tread, as though it has been thoroughly smoothed out by practice" (τὸ πρεσβύτατον δήλωμα προκοπῆς τοῦ Ἡσιόδου, μηκέτι προσάντη μηδ' ὄρθιον ἄγαν ἀλλὰ ῥᾳδίαν καὶ λείαν καὶ δι' εὐπετείας εἶναι τὴν ὁδόν, οἷον ἐκλεαινομένην τῇ ἀσκήσει).

[51] Plutarch notes that his Stoic opponents enact correction of the young especially through the use of praise and blame (τούτοις μάλιστα χρῶνται πρὸς τὰς ἐπανορθώσεις). Even the Stoic Cato, Plutarch writes, preferred youths who would blush over those who were pale, since he could habituate them in the correct manner and teach them to fear censure more than hard work and suspicion of wrongdoing more than danger (Plutarch, *On Compliancy*

the basis of certain standards of what they see to be honorable / shameful before they have access to the contents and reasons why what they have come to treat as honorable / shameful and appropriate / inappropriate ought to be seen as such.[52] Children learn to track what is honorable and shameful, like a well-trained set of hunting dogs.[53]

The process of shaping these habits and evaluative standards brings out another sense in which the passions serve as the grips of philosophy: like oar-handles of a ship's rudder, we can use them to guide the progress of children in the formation of their habits. As we saw in the description of certain spirited passions that function like rudders (ὥσπερ οἴαξι) in *Pericles* 15.1–2 (=[T83]), Plutarch lists among the spirited emotions that serve as grips in *On Moral Virtue* 452D3–8 (=[T85]), not only shame (αἰσχύνη), a desire for honor (φιλοτιμία), and repentance (μετάνοια), which help to redirect and change our course, but also pleasure (ἡδονή) and pain (λύπη), which help us to shape the spirited emotions of shame and the desire for honor.

528F1–4). As I note below, this use of praise and blame to bring about shame over one's inadequacies fits uneasily within the Stoic view that passions such as shame are states of erroneous belief. See §IV below.

[52] Cf. Plato, *Protagoras* 325c5–e1: "Beginning when they are small children, and for as long as they live, they teach and advise them. As soon as one understands what is said, his nurse, mother, pedagogue, and his father himself compete with one another so that he is the best he can be, *teaching and pointing out to him in every situation, both in word and deed, what is just and what unjust, that this is honorable but that is shameful, that this is sanctioned while that is unsanctioned, and 'do these things' but 'do not do those other things.'* If he obeys willingly, that is, but if he does not, just like a piece of dry wood that is twisted and bent, they make him straight through threats and blows. Next, sending them to the school-house they entrust teachers to care more about the good conduct of children than about their instruction in grammar and in playing the cithara" (ἐκ παίδων σμικρῶν ἀρξάμενοι, μέχρι οὗπερ ἂν ζῶσι, καὶ διδάσκουσι καὶ νουθετοῦσιν. ἐπειδὰν θᾶττον συνιῇ τις τὰ λεγόμενα, καὶ τροφὸς καὶ μήτηρ καὶ παιδαγωγὸς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ πατὴρ περὶ τούτου διαμάχονται, ὅπως ὡς βέλτιστος ἔσται ὁ παῖς, παρ' ἕκαστον καὶ ἔργον καὶ λόγον διδάσκοντες καὶ ἐνδεικνύμενοι ὅτι τὸ μὲν δίκαιον, τὸ δὲ ἄδικον, καὶ τόδε μὲν καλόν, τόδε δὲ αἰσχρόν, καὶ τόδε μὲν ὅσιον, τόδε δὲ ἀνόσιον, καὶ "τὰ μὲν ποίει, τὰ δὲ μὴ ποίει." καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ἑκὼν πείθηται· εἰ δὲ μή, ὥσπερ ξύλον διαστρεφόμενον καὶ καμπτόμενον εὐθύνουσιν ἀπειλαῖς καὶ πληγαῖς. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα εἰς διδασκάλων πέμποντες πολὺ μᾶλλον ἐντέλλονται ἐπιμελεῖσθαι εὐκοσμίας τῶν παίδων ἢ γραμμάτων τε καὶ κιθαρίσεως); *Laws* 2, 653a5–c4=[T92] below.

[53] We are to keep children on the right path and protect them from alluring distractions, "just as those who hunt with dogs do not allow their pups to turn aside and pursue every which smell, but draw them and check them with the leash, keeping their sense-perceptive faculty pure and free from mixture with other scents for their own proper work, in order that they more vigorously cling closely to the tracks" (καθάπερ οἱ κυνηγοὶ τοὺς σκύλακας οὐκ ἐῶσιν ἐκτρέπεσθαι καὶ διώκειν πᾶσαν ὀδμήν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ῥυτῆρσιν ἕλκουσι καὶ ἀνακρούουσι καθαρὸν αὐτῶν καὶ ἄκρατον φυλάττοντες τὸ αἰσθητήριον ἐπὶ τὸ οἰκεῖον ἔργον, ἵν' εὐτονώτερον ἐμφύηται τοῖς ἴχνεσι, *On Being a Busybody* 520E7–11). Cf. also the sheep / shepherd metaphor in *Laws* 7, 808d1–e4 (for which see n. 25 above).

If our sense of shame and desire for honor are sufficiently healthy and intact, then praise and blame, once again, are powerful instruments used like oar-handles to direct us. A proper sense of shame and desire for honor, for instance, helps one to be responsive to criticism and receive a dose, as it were, of corrective medication aimed at the improvement of one's soul when one errs. If one fails to have a proper emotional response when one's moral fault is revealed, he fails to receive the drug (φάρμακον) aimed at correcting his character (πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν ἤθους, *On Listening to Lectures* 46D4–13[54]; *On Moral Virtue* 452C6–D1).[55] Use of praise is preferable treatment, like a doctor's prescription of proper diet and rest over the use of drugs (*How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 73D10–E2).[56]

Unlike in the majority of examples in §I, however, the grips of philosophy are intended to steer the soul in its *development* to form habits and dispositions, not merely to change someone's

[54] "But, if one is not humbled at hearing a reproach and admonition, which make use of a convicting word as a *drug* with a stinging bite and is *aimed at the correction of his character*, and if he is not full of sweat and agitation of mind and does not burn with shame in his soul but instead is unmoved and grins and treats it slightingly with banter, he has the character of a dreadfully slavish young person who is incapable of feeling shame. This insensitivity is due to a familiarity and constant contact with erroneous ways. Such a person does not, as it were, receive a stripe from the lash on his hardness of soul, as though it were a bit of callous flesh" (ἐπαφῆς δὲ καὶ νουθεσίας πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν ἤθους ὥσπερ φαρμάκῳ δάκνοντι λόγῳ χρωμένης ἐλέγχοντι μὴ συνεσταλμένον ἀκούειν μηδ᾽ ἱδρῶτος καὶ ἰλίγγου μεστόν, αἰσχύνῃ φλεγόμενον τὴν ψυχήν, ἀλλ᾽ ἄτρεπτον καὶ σεσηρότα καὶ κατειρωνευόμενον, ἀνελευθέρου τινὸς δεινῶς καὶ ἀπαθοῦς πρὸς τὸ αἰδεῖσθαι νέου διὰ συνήθειαν ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ συνέχειαν, ὥσπερ ἐν σκληρᾷ σαρκὶ καὶ τυλώδει τῇ ψυχῇ μώλωπα μὴ λαμβάνοντος).

As Xenophontos 2016, pp. 38–40, notes, "For Plato ἐπανόρθωμα is an intellectual procedure designed to rectify conceptual errors" (p. 38). Cf. *Protagoras* 340a, d; *Theaetetus* 146c; *Gorgias* 461c. Aristotle uses correction once in terms of shaping character (ἦθος, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1165b), but generally to describe the correction of mental errors (1135a, 1137b). Plutarch, however, frequently uses the term to describe correction of character and habits, though he does, however, at times use terminology for correction in an intellectual sense: *Demosthenes* 6.2, 8.2; *Lives of the Ten Orators* 844E; *On How a Young Man Should Study Poetry* 22B, 34B; *Cicero* 4.7, and *Caesar* 59.2. For discussion of these uses and further instances see Xenophontos, p. 39, n. 65.

[55] Plutarch elsewhere describes the cure or treatment with the term θεράπευμα (cf. *On Compliancy* 529A7–10), which can indicate a general sense of attendance to, care for, surgical intervention, or curative drugs / herbs (for this last "concrete" use with the plural τὰ θεραπεύματα, see Hippocrates *On Sickness* 4.34.20–5). Cf. also *On Talkativeness* 502B1–C1, where Plutarch describes the cure and treatment that philosophy provides for inordinate behavior with both θεράπευμα and φάρμακον.

[56] "For, just as a doctor with good intentions would rather remove disease from one whose sick through sleep and nutrition than by the use drugs like castor and scammony, likewise a suitable friend and good father and teacher like to use praise more than censure for the correction of character" (ὡς γὰρ ἰατρὸς εὐγνώμων βούλοιτ᾽ ἂν ὕπνῳ καὶ τροφῇ μᾶλλον ἢ καστορίῳ καὶ σκαμωνίῳ τὸ νόσημα λῦσαι τοῦ κάμνοντος, οὕτω καὶ φίλος ἐπιεικὴς καὶ πατὴρ χρηστὸς καὶ διδάσκαλος ἐπαίνῳ μᾶλλον ἢ ψόγῳ χαίρει πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν ἤθους χρώμενος).

mind or action at a particular moment. An educator takes hold of these grips for the *benefit* of students' souls, shaping their character to have a more enduring quality. The goal is for children and students to develop the right kinds of habits that continue to guide their future actions and orient them to desire and act correctly.[57]

§II.c. The Grips of Philosophy as Enduring Holds on Character

Eventually, shaping these habits, namely the way one is oriented to act and react, produces a more stable character. Plutarch takes the etymological connection seriously: changing one's ways (οἱ τρόποι) and habits (τὰ ἔθη / τὰ ἤθη) amounts to changing one's character (οἱ τρόποι / τὰ ἤθη, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 551E6–9).[58] The disposition becomes

[57] Plutarch even extends this goal to slaves that are under one's supervision, arguing that properly attending to slaves' sense of shame brings about moderation in their souls: "in those [slaves] who show a sense of shame, the fear that comes about brings self-control" (αἰδουμένοις ὁ σωφρονίζων ἐγγίνεται φόβος, *On the Control of Anger* 459D2–6). *Contra* Van Hoof 2007, p. 75, I do not think that Plutarch, or the speaker Fundanus, is solely concerned with the moral development of the master in *On the Control of Anger*. Masters ought to avoid punishing their slaves excessively to avoid damaging *their own* character, as though avoiding a perverse pleasure of being drunk on cruelly punishing others or taking vengeance (*On the Control of Anger* 460C1–7; cf. *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550E2–551A3), and masters may use their treatment of slaves as practice in moderating their own anger (459B). Nevertheless, Fundanus notes how much better it is to train slaves to become moderate *in their own character*. In *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance*, moreover, the goal is to *benefit* the one punished. Likewise, the moderation brought about in one's slaves is meant to bring benefit and correction to their habits and character, even if that goal is in line with the further goal of benefitting the masters themselves. On the decorum linked with moderate treatment of slaves see also Harris 2001, pp 317–36, esp. 327–8.

Poor supervision of slaves and neglect of how one's actions affect their character can in fact lead to bad results. "Constant and merciless beating does not produce repentance from evil-doing," Fundanus argues in Plutarch's *On the Control of anger*, "but rather forethought to not get caught" (ἡ δὲ συνεχὴς πληγὴ καὶ ἀπαραίτητος οὐ μετάνοιαν ἐμποιεῖ τοῦ κακουργεῖν ἀλλὰ τοῦ λανθάνειν πρόνοιαν μᾶλλον, 459D4–6). Cruel treatment, Plutarch argues elsewhere, renders one callous and unresponsive to improvement through punishment, since it often removes a sense of goodwill and a sense of shame. Cf. *Precepts of Statecraft* 820F11–B11: Just as the affection of dogs (κυνῶν ἀσπασμός), which serve us in the hunt, and the goodwill of horses (ἵππων εὔνοια), which serve as beasts of burden, is not to be spurned (οὐ ἀπόβλητον) but is useful and pleasant (χρήσιμον καὶ ἡδύ), while the cruel treatment of bees, dogs, and horses has a negative effect, likewise instilling goodwill and trust within one's human subjects renders them willingly submissive and gentle (χειροήθη καὶ πρᾷον ἑκουσίως) to one's rule. Cf. also *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 74E3–6 and *On Listening to Lectures* 46D4–13, where Plutarch argues that improper upbringing can snuff out the sense of shame necessary for improvement of character. On the rough treatment of individuals who lack a proper sensitivity to shame and honor in Aristotle see *Nicomachean Ethics* 10.9, 1179b11–16, 23, 27–9 and 1180a4–12; Sherman 1989, p. 164.

[58] Cf. Plutarch *Sulla* 30.5, where Plutarch treats moral character (τὰ ἤθη) as synonymous with one's character / ways (οἱ τρόποι): Sulla "probably attached to great offices of governance a bad reputation, as though these offices did not allow men's characters to remain in the same condition as their character was from the beginning" (εἰκότως προσετρίψατο ταῖς μεγάλαις ἐξουσίαις διαβολὴν ὡς τὰ ἤθη μένειν οὐκ ἐώσαις ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τρόπων). On the nearly synonymous use of τὰ ἤθη and οἱ τρόποι in Plutarch's works cf. Gill 1983b, p. 474. On the

settled, like a dye that becomes fixed over time and is hard to wash out (ἡ βαφὴ ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ δευσοποιὸς οὖσα καὶ δυσέκπλυτος, Plutarch, *Philosophers and Men in Power* 779C1–6; cf. *On Moral Virtue* 443D1–10). Drawing on the image from the *Republic*, the dye represents the inculcation of correct standards within the spirited part of the soul, which absorbs the laws like a dye (τοὺς νόμους δέξοιντο ὥσπερ βαφήν, *Republic* 4, 429b8–430c6),[59] adding further credence to Plutarch's identification of shaping habits as the place where reason and the laws first get a grip on the soul in *On Moral Virtue* 452D3–8=[T85]. The beliefs and standards of what we ought to pursue or avoid permeate and soak into, so to speak, the character of our spirited passions.

Plutarch, then, emphasizes much more the *effect* that instruction and guided behavior plays on the formation of *habits* as the most vital aspect of our early education, more so than children's understanding and attendance to the *contents* of wise precepts and instructions they receive from their teachers and parents, which is to come later.[60] In *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance*, the grip that habituation takes upon our nature, in fact, has the *greatest* control over

---

connection between the naming of character (ἦθος) from habit (ἔθος) see also Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 443C5–D1; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.1, 1103a17–18; *Eudemian Ethics* 2.2, 1220a39–b6; and *Politics* 7.13, 1332b1 ff.; Sherman 1989, p. 177; and Kraut 2012, p. 538.

On the problem of static character tropes in Plutarch's *Lives*, despite his description of molding and shaping character in the *Moralia*, see Gill 1983b, Duff 1999 and 2008, who note that the representation of unchanging static character in the *Lives* is largely due to the influence of the genre of biographical representations of character and also probably due to the source material that Plutarch inherits. Cf. also Dihle 1956, pp. 57–87; Pelling 1988 and 2000; Swain 1989; Xenophontos 2016, pp. 29–41.

[59] Cf. also *Republic* 7, 522a3–9, 538a9–e4; 10, 619c6–d1; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1104b11–13; 1105a6–7. See also §VII of Chapter 4.

[60] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 7, 522a3–9: The early education of the guardians educates them in habits, providing them with a certain harmonious disposition, not knowledge, according to its harmony, and a certain rhythmic disposition according to its rhythm, and, in its stories, other habits akin to these (ἔθεσι παιδεύουσα τοὺς φύλακας, κατά τε ἁρμονίαν εὐαρμοστίαν τινά, οὐκ ἐπιστήμην, παραδιδοῦσα, καὶ κατὰ ῥυθμὸν εὐρυθμίαν, ἔν τε τοῖς λόγοις ἕτερα τούτων ἀδελφὰ ἔθη); *Republic* 7, 538a9–e4: Guardians will be equipped to pursue what is honorable and shun what is shameful reliably based on the standards they were taught by their upbringing (ἐν οἷς ἐκτεθράμμεθα ὥσπερ ὑπὸ γονεῦσι), but will not have a sufficient grasp due from that upbringing alone to explain why they hold to those beliefs and habits unless they have further education. Cf. also *Republic* 10, 619c6–d1: In the Myth of Er, the soul of one who participated in virtue based on habit without philosophy (ἔθει ἄνευ φιλοσοφίας ἀρετῆς μετειληφότα) will fail to make a good choice of life the next time round. Cf. Wilberding 2009, pp. 361–7.

our character:

[T88] ἦθος ὡς πλεῖστον ἐνδύεται τὸ ἔθος καὶ κρατεῖ μάλιστα καθαπτόμενον.

> habit to the greatest extent possible enters into character and comes to have the greatest control once it has been gripped.
>
> (Plutarch, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 551e8–9)

Here, the grip of philosophy is not only the point at which philosophy first gets a hold on our character, putting our foot on the path to virtue from the beginning, but it also is the *enduring hold*, as in the metaphor of wrestling,[61] that does not let up and additionally *guides* our progress.[62]

By guiding us, directing and redirecting our actions, teachers instill habits until we no longer require constant oversight from another to restrain us from error (*On Talkativeness* 511E8–11).[63] As I already explored in Chapter 4, spirited passions serve to help guide one's actions and desires on a path consonant with certain standards that have been inculcated by habit (Plutarch, *On Moral Progress* 83A4–B8=[T64] in Chapter 4). More and more they become a guiding force within the soul. So, this early shaping of habits not only helps children to take their first footstep on the path to virtue (Plutarch, *Can Virtue be Taught* 439F2–5), but also helps to keep them on that path.

For these reasons, Plutarch's remarks at the end of *On Moral Virtue* should come as no surprise. The cultivation of good habits, taking pleasure in what is honorable and feeling pain in what is shameful, is the greatest and most honorable education available to the young (*On Moral*

---

[61] On "grips" (λαβαί) used in this sense, see Plato, *Republic* 8, 544b5; *Phaedrus* 236b8; Plutarch, *Eumenes* 7.10.

[62] Cf. Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451B12–C1: "For it is by habit that [a human] remains consistent, by nature that he is nurtured and uses reason and thought" (καὶ γὰρ ἕξει [ὁ ἄνθρωπος, B11] συνέχεται καὶ φύσει τρέφεται καὶ λόγῳ χρῆται καὶ διανοίᾳ).

[63] "Habituation is great for all things…for it is not possible to restrain the babbler as though taking hold of the bit in his mouth, but one must overcome his disease by habituation" (μέγα πρὸς πάνθ' ὁ ἐθισμός ἐστι...οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ὡς χαλινῶν ἐφαψαμένους ἐπισχεῖν τὸν ἀδολέσχην, ἀλλ' ἔθει δεῖ κρατῆσαι τοῦ νοσήματος). While in this passage Plutarch has framed the need for habituation negatively, noting that constant restraint of those who have vicious habits is not enough but that habituation is needed to stop them, the upshot is that if habituation is effective, then it will remedy the propensity to vice and no longer require consistent and continued application of restraint.

Virtue 452D8–12=[T87]). This education is primary since it lays the foundation for our later development, comes earlier, and plays a role in guiding our continued development on the path to virtue.

§III Aristotle and Plato on Habituation of Passions

At first glance, Plutarch seems to be more in line with Aristotle than with Plato's *Republic* in emphasizing the training and habituation of passions. As noted above, Xenocrates, a head of Plato's Academy, seems to be on good Platonic footing in his identification of music, geometry, and astronomy as the "grips of philosophy," the preparatory education (προπαιδεία) for progress in philosophy and virtue (Plato, *Republic* 7, 521d13–40c2, esp. 536d4–7). Plutarch, however, seems closer to Aristotle in laying the emphasis on the formation of passions that occurs earlier, even though Aristotle falls within the Platonic tradition for Plutarch.[64] According to Aristotle, education in moral theory cannot take hold unless students already have a proper education of their passions *before* embarking on the study of ethics:

[T89] ὁ δὲ λόγος καὶ ἡ διδαχὴ μή ποτ' οὐκ ἐν ἅπασιν ἰσχύει, ἀλλὰ δεῖ προδιειργάσθαι τοῖς ἔθεσι τὴν τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ ψυχὴν πρὸς τὸ καλῶς χαίρειν καὶ μισεῖν, ὥσπερ γῆν τὴν θρέψουσαν τὸ σπέρμα.

> Discussion and teaching may not be strong always in everything, but the soul of the listener must have been cultivated beforehand in character for the purpose of feeling enjoyment and hating well, just like soil provides nourishment to the seed.
> (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 10.9, 1179b23–6).[65]

[64] Cf. Dillon 1977, pp. 193–8; Dillon and Long 1988, pp. 1–14 ("Introduction"); Gill 2006, p. 229; Karamanolis 2006, pp. 85–126. See §IV of the Introduction and §VII of Chapter 2.

[65] Cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 8.5, 1340a14–18: "And since music happens to belong to things that are pleasant, and virtue concerns feeling enjoyment, loving, and hating correctly, we clearly ought to learn and to become habituated to nothing so much as to making judgments correctly and feeling enjoyment in suitable characters and noble actions" (ἐπεὶ δὲ συμβέβηκεν εἶναι τὴν μουσικὴν τῶν ἡδέων, τὴν δ' ἀρετὴν περὶ τὸ χαίρειν ὀρθῶς καὶ φιλεῖν καὶ μισεῖν, δεῖ δηλονότι μανθάνειν καὶ συνεθίζεσθαι μηθὲν οὕτως ὡς τὸ κρίνειν ὀρθῶς καὶ τὸ χαίρειν τοῖς ἐπιεικέσιν ἤθεσι καὶ ταῖς καλαῖς πράξεσιν).

The seeds of education can only flourish and grow into fully mature virtue if the soul is already in a proper and sufficiently rich state to nourish it.[66] Cultivation of character, which Plutarch as well as Aristotle identifies as the habituation of our passionate nature, must come first. It will be hard to be educated in virtue unless one has already been reared in one's habits correctly (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 10.9, 1179b28–1180a1).[67]

Plutarch's insistence that the education of passions through habituation is *more important* than more advanced studies, against Xenocrates' position, is also in line with Aristotle, who also emphasizes the great importance of habituated passions for the development of character:

[T90] οὐ μικρὸν οὖν διαφέρει τὸ οὕτως ἢ οὕτως εὐθὺς ἐκ νέων ἐθίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάμπολυ, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ πᾶν.

> To habituate someone this way or that from their youth makes no small difference, but a very big one, or rather all the difference. (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.1, 1103b23–5)

To prepare the soul for virtue, parents, teachers, and instructors must first look to shaping the habits and passions of children.[68] These habits are more important, because, if they are not in place, one will not be prepared for further advancement in virtue, engaging in studies of ethics or politics (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1.4, 1095b4–6).[69]

---

[66] Cf. Tigner 2000, p. 14.

[67] "In general, it seems that passion does not yield to reason but to force. It is necessary then for the character that belongs to virtue to somehow already be present, namely one that feels affinity for what is noble and disgust for what is shameful. From one's youth it is hard to obtain correct education toward virtue unless one has been reared under laws of such a kind. For to live moderately and with self-control is not pleasant to many people, especially the young. For this reason, it is necessary for nurture and activities to be arranged by laws, since what is habituated will not be painful" (ὅλως τ' οὐ δοκεῖ λόγῳ ὑπείκειν τὸ πάθος ἀλλὰ βίᾳ. δεῖ δὴ τὸ ἦθος προϋπάρχειν πως οἰκεῖον τῆς ἀρετῆς, στέργον τὸ καλὸν καὶ δυσχεραῖνον τὸ αἰσχρόν. ἐκ νέου δ' ἀγωγῆς ὀρθῆς τυχεῖν πρὸς ἀρετὴν χαλεπὸν μὴ ὑπὸ τοιούτοις τραφέντα νόμοις· τὸ γὰρ σωφρόνως καὶ καρτερικῶς ζῆν οὐχ ἡδὺ τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἄλλως τε καὶ νέοις. διὸ νόμοις δεῖ τετάχθαι τὴν τροφὴν καὶ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα· οὐκ ἔσται γὰρ λυπηρὰ συνήθη γενόμενα).

[68] Cf. Sherman 1997, p. 80 and n. 111: "The bulk of the work [of habituating passions] is done early on under the tutelage of teachers and elders and within the context of early family life" (p. 80).

[69] "For this reason, one who is to become a sufficiently competent student concerning what is noble, just, and, in general, with politics, needs to have been well-trained in their habits" (διὸ δεῖ τοῖς ἔθεσιν ἠχθαι καλῶς τὸν περὶ καλῶν καὶ δικαίων καὶ ὅλως τῶν πολιτικῶν ἀκουσόμενον ἱκανῶς).

Although it might appear that Plutarch pits Aristotle against Plato on the topic of preparatory education, we have already seen some indications that habituation of passions plays an important preliminary role in character formation even within Plato's *Republic*. The idea that habituation of passions is necessary for character formation is expressed more explicitly in *Republic* 3 (401e1–402a4), but nevertheless is present in descriptions of the early education as shaping the souls of the young in *Republic* 2 (377c3–6) and forming their characters early in life through habituation, as though dyeing their souls with a purple hue that is difficult to remove, in *Republic* 4 (429b8–430c6).[70] Plutarch seems right on track, in fact, when he writes that reason and the laws first take their grip on our passionate nature in *On Moral Virtue* 452D3–8=[T85], just as the laws and standards that provide guidance are absorbed and, in a way, take hold of the spirited part of the soul in *Republic* 4's image of dying the soul a purple hue.

Aristotle even gives credit to Plato for the view that habituating children to take pleasure and feel pain correctly is preparatory and the first and primary education of the young:

[T91] διὸ δεῖ ἦχθαί πως εὐθὺς ἐκ νέων, ὡς ὁ Πλάτων φησίν, ὥστε χαίρειν τε καὶ λυπεῖσθαι οἷς δεῖ· ἡ γὰρ ὀρθὴ παιδεία αὕτη ἐστίν. ἔτι δ' εἰ αἱ ἀρεταί εἰσι περὶ πράξεις καὶ πάθη, παντὶ δὲ πάθει καὶ πάσῃ πράξει ἕπεται ἡδονὴ καὶ λύπη, καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη ἡ ἀρετὴ περὶ ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας.

> For this reason one ought straightway to be guided from one's youth, as Plato says, so as to feel enjoyment and pain in the things that one ought to, since this is correct education. And moreover, if virtues are concerned with actions and passions, and pleasure and pain follow upon every passion and action, then for this reason virtue concerns pleasures and pains. (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.3, 1104b11–16)

Aristotle probably refers to Plato's *Laws* 1–2, which are most explicit on this point. In Book 1, the chief point of education (κεφάλαιον δὴ παιδείας) centers on teaching children to have

[70] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 7, 522a3–9, 538a9–e4; 10, 619c6–d1. Cf. also Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.3, 1104b11–13, 1105a6–7. On Aristotle's debt to Plato on the role of habituation see Lord 1982; Irwin 1999; Broadie and Rowe 2002; and Vasiliou 2011, pp. 170–1.

correct dispositions to love and hate appropriately (643c1–d3).[71] The interlocutors of the *Laws* later call this education of passions, which prepares one for complete virtue in being a good citizen (643e5–7), the only definition of education (μόνη παιδεία, 643e4–644a2[72] and 2, 653C7–8[73]).

Plutarch's criticism of Xenocrates and emphasis on early education, in fact, follows closely the views laid out in *Laws* 1–2. Book 2 argues that habituation of passions to correct ends takes place before children understand the reasons why their dispositions to take pleasure in honorable and good ends are justified and their hatred for what is shameful and vicious is warranted:

[T92] λέγω τοίνυν ⟨τὴν⟩[74] τῶν παίδων παιδικὴν εἶναι πρώτην αἴσθησιν ἡδονὴν καὶ λύπην, καὶ ἐν οἷς ἀρετὴ ψυχῇ καὶ κακία παραγίγνεται πρῶτον, ταῦτ' εἶναι, φρόνησιν δὲ καὶ ἀληθεῖς δόξας βεβαίους, εὐτυχὴς[75] ὅτῳ καὶ πρὸς τὸ γῆρας παρεγένετο· τέλεος δ' οὖν ἔστ' ἄνθρωπος ταῦτα καὶ τὰ ἐν τούτοις πάντα κεκτημένος ἀγαθά. παιδείαν δὴ λέγω τὴν παραγιγνομένην πρῶτον παισὶν ἀρετήν· ἡδονὴ δὴ καὶ φιλία καὶ λύπη καὶ μῖσος ἂν ὀρθῶς ἐν ψυχαῖς ἐγγίγνωνται μήπω δυναμένων λόγῳ λαμβάνειν, λαβόντων δὲ τὸν λόγον, συμφωνήσωσι τῷ λόγῳ ⟨τῷ⟩[76] ὀρθῶς εἰθίσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν προσηκόντων ἐθῶν, αὕτη 'σθ' ἡ συμφωνία σύμπασα μὲν ἀρετή, τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας τεθραμμένον αὐτῆς ὀρθῶς ὥστε μισεῖν μὲν ἃ χρὴ μισεῖν εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς μέχρι τέλους, στέργειν δὲ ἃ χρὴ στέργειν, τοῦτ' αὐτὸ ἀποτεμὼν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ παιδείαν προσαγορεύων, κατά γε τὴν ἐμὴν ὀρθῶς ἂν προσαγορεύοις.

---

[71] "One ought…to attempt through play to turn the pleasures and desires of children in that direction, where they ought to have their end when they arrive [as virtuous adults]. We in fact define the chief point of education to be the correct rearing that especially leads the soul of one at play to love the thing that one ought to love when one becomes complete in the excellence of the matter as an adult" (χρή…πειρᾶσθαι διὰ τῶν παιδιῶν ἐκεῖσε τρέπειν τὰς ἡδονὰς καὶ ἐπιθυμίας τῶν παίδων, οἳ ἀφικομένους αὐτοὺς δεῖ τέλος ἔχειν. κεφάλαιον δὴ παιδείας λέγομεν τὴν ὀρθὴν τροφήν, ἣ τοῦ παίζοντος τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς ἔρωτα μάλιστα ἄξει τούτου ὃ δεήσει γενόμενον ἄνδρ' αὐτὸν τέλειον εἶναι τῆς τοῦ πράγματος ἀρετῆς).

[72] "But the education aimed at virtue from childhood, which makes one a desirer and lover of becoming a perfect citizen, and one who knows how to rule and be ruled justly, the argument, as it seems to me, sets this rearing apart and now *would want to call this alone education*" (τὴν δὲ πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐκ παίδων παιδείαν, ποιοῦσαν ἐπιθυμητήν τε καὶ ἐραστὴν τοῦ πολίτην γενέσθαι τέλεον, ἄρχειν τε καὶ ἄρχεσθαι ἐπιστάμενον μετὰ δίκης. ταύτην τὴν τροφὴν ἀφορισάμενος ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνεται, <u>νῦν βούλοιτ' ἂν μόνην παιδείαν προσαγορεύειν</u>).

[73] The interlocutors recapitulate their point on education: "Indeed, when these pleasures and pains have been reared correctly, it is education" (τούτων γὰρ δὴ τῶν ὀρθῶς τεθραμμένων ἡδονῶν καὶ λυπῶν παιδειῶν οὐσῶν).

[74] Accepting the insertion by Richard Janko, suggested in a personal comment.

[75] Accepting the emendation by Ast from εὐτυχές, a correction that Janko also suggested independently.

[76] Accepting the emendation of Schöpsdau (following Stallbaum) of τῷ before ὀρθῶς. Cf. Meyer 2015, p. 210.

> Therefore, I say that the first childhood sensations of children are experiences of pleasure and pain, and these are the means through which virtue and vice first come to the soul, while one is lucky if wisdom and securely held true beliefs come to them even with old age. One is a complete human being if he has acquired these and all the goods encompassed by them. I say, in point of fact, that education is the first emergence of virtue in children whenever pleasure, affection, pain and hatred first occur correctly in their souls even though they have not yet received them with reason, but once they have received reason, these feelings harmonize with reason because they have been habituated correctly by fitting habits. This harmony is as a whole virtue. Part of this [virtue] is being reared correctly concerning pleasures and pains so that one hates what one ought to hate straight through from beginning to end and loves what one ought to love. If you should separate this part off in the argument and call it education, you would call it the right name, as far as I see it. (Plato, *Laws* 2, 653a5–c4)

Habituated passions must come first. These orientations to act and feel in the right way are in harmony with reason, or in accordance with reason, even though we only come to understand later why we should love or hate what we have already become disposed to see as honorable or shameful from early life (2, 659d4–e5).[77]

Plutarch, then, is not pitting Aristotle against Plato, a point he would deny since he takes Aristotle to be part of the Platonic tradition and generally in line with Plato's intended teachings.[78] In any case, upon surveying Plato's *Laws*, we see that Plutarch is on good Platonic

---

[77] "Therefore, in order that the soul of a child not be habituated to take pleasure and feel pain in things in a way that is contrary to the law and to those who have obey by the law, but in order that it [the soul of a child] follow together in taking pleasure and feeling pain in those same things as an old man, for those reasons, what we call songs, but what seem to me really to have become enchantments for souls, which in all seriousness aim at the kind of harmony that we described, but because the souls of the young are unable to endure seriousness, these are called and acted out as play and songs." (ἵν' οὖν ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ παιδὸς μὴ ἐναντία χαίρειν καὶ λυπεῖσθαι ἐθίζηται τῷ νόμῳ καὶ τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου πεπεισμένοις, ἀλλὰ συνέπηται χαίρουσά τε καὶ λυπουμένη τοῖς αὐτοῖς τούτοις οἵσπερ ὁ χαίρουσά τε καὶ λυπουμένη τοῖς αὐτοῖς τούτοις οἵσπερ ὁ γέρων, τούτων ἕνεκα, ἃς ᾠδὰς καλοῦμεν, ὄντως μὲν ἐπῳδαὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὗται νῦν γεγονέναι, πρὸς τὴν τοιαύτην ἣν λέγομεν συμφωνίαν ἐσπουδασμέναι, διὰ δὲ τὸ σπουδὴν μὴ δύνασθαι φέρειν τὰς τῶν νέων ψυχάς, παιδιαί τε καὶ ᾠδαὶ καλεῖσθαι καὶ πράττεσθαι). On the importance of play in early education cf. Saunders 1972 on *Laws* 1, 643c, and Meyer 2015, pp. 164–5. Cf. also Russell 2014, pp. 25–6.

Kamtekar 2010 (see esp. p. 128) and Bobonich 2010a both consider the attunement of pleasures in Plato's *Laws* as an attempt to bring the soul to take pleasure in *order*, which will lead to rational appreciation of order and advancement in rational ascent to philosophical investigation. Cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 8.5, 1340a14–25. My focus in Plutarch's works, however, is on the cultivation of passionate dispositions, not on further advancement in rational thought through the process of habituating passions, though that is no doubt part of the process that Plutarch has in mind for education, as is evidenced in §IV below.

[78] See n. 64 above.

footing and may in fact be a better interpreter of Plato's works than his predecessor Xenocrates, since he has managed to draw upon both Plato's *Republic* and *Laws* to support his position that passions play a fundamentally important role in preparing the soul for progress in virtue.

§IV Reflection and Shame as One Becomes the Cultivator of One's Own Passions

In time, as children mature in reason, they not only reflect upon their reasons for action, but also begin to cultivate their own character by shaping their passions.[79] At the beginning of *On Listening to Lectures*, Plutarch exhorts his reader to take stock of his newfound responsibility in forming his own character:

[T93] σὺ δὲ πολλάκις ἀκηκοὼς ὅτι ταὐτόν ἐστι τὸ ἕπεσθαι θεῷ καὶ τὸ πείθεσθαι λόγῳ, νόμιζε τὴν εἰς ἄνδρας ἐκ παίδων ἀγωγὴν οὐκ ἀρχῆς εἶναι τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσιν ἀποβολήν, ἀλλὰ μεταβολὴν ἄρχοντος, ἀντὶ μισθωτοῦ τινος ἢ ἀργυρωνήτου θεῖον ἡγεμόνα τοῦ βίου λαμβάνουσι τὸν λόγον, ᾧ τοὺς ἑπομένους ἄξιόν ἐστι μόνους ἐλευθέρους νομίζειν.

> But you, since you have often heard that to follow god is the same thing as obeying reason, consider the training from childhood to manhood not to be a departure from its beginning for those who are wise, but instead a change of the ruling element; instead of a hired servant or silver-bought slave, they take reason as their divine guide of life, and it is only those who follow reason that are worthy of being considered free.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Listening to Lectures* 37D9–E4)

Becoming more autonomous, Plutarch writes, is not a radical break from being habituated by one's instructors. Transitioning to a more autonomous stage of life, the young man must now take on a greater responsibility.[80] No longer is his character primarily under the tutelage and guidance of parent, pedagogue, or slave. A changing of the ruling power in his life (μεταβολὴ ἄρχοντος) recasts the rule of reason from outside himself to the reason within him.

---

[79] Cf. Gill 1983b, p. 470: "On becoming an adult (a process associated, in ancient thought, with the development of rationality), the person becomes, in principle, capable of playing a major role in his own character-formation through reasoned reflection and decision." See also *ibid*. p. 470, n. 7.

[80] Cf. Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics* 3.5, 1114b22–3: We become responsible for our own habits of virtue and vice (τῶν ἕξεων συναίτιοί πως αὐτοί ἐσμεν). Cf. Sherman 1997, p. 78.

Plutarch's *Moralia* are full of advice for this stage of life when one first takes steps to become the cultivator and craftsman of one's own passions and character. He advises the young on how they are to continue to learn and guard themselves from vice not only in *On Listening to Lectures*, but also in *How a Young Man Should Read Poetry*.[81] In the latter case, he explicitly attacks the Epicureans and argues for the usefulness of poetry in moral education. Yet, at the same time, he implicitly argues against the psychological criticism of poetry from Plato's *Republic* 10, since one begins to discriminate in how one allows poetry to affect one's passions and dispositions.[82]

For those who struggle with excessive anger, talkativeness, curiosity, or bashfulness, Plutarch has particular works dedicated to each of these emotions in the *Moralia* that provide methods of diagnosis and exercises to train oneself to experience emotions in their proper, moderate forms.[83] In numerous works, including *On Moral Progress*, Plutarch is concerned that

---

[81] Perhaps also in the lost work, *On How One is to Use School Exercises* (no. 106 in the Lamprias Catalogue).

[82] See for instance Plutarch, *How a Young Man Should Study Poetry* 15D7–14: "Shall we, then, plastering over the ears of the young, just like the Ithacans, with some unyielding and water-resistant wax, force them, upon taking up their Epicurean raft, to flee and row past poetry, or rather should we stand them upright next to certain straight and correct reason and bind them fast to it and guide their judgment and protect it so that they are not carried away by delight toward what is harmful?" (πότερον οὖν τῶν νέων ὥσπερ τῶν Ἰθακησίων σκληρῷ τινι τὰ ὦτα καὶ ἀτέγκτῳ κηρῷ καταπλάττοντες ἀναγκάζωμεν αὐτοὺς τὸ Ἐπικούρειον ἀκάτιον ἀραμένους ποιητικὴν φεύγειν καὶ παρεξελαύνειν, ἢ μᾶλλον ὀρθῷ τινι λογισμῷ καὶ παριστάντες καὶ καταδέοντες, τὴν κρίσιν, ὅπως μὴ παραφέρηται τῷ τέρποντι πρὸς τὸ βλάπτον, ἀπευθύνωμεν καὶ παραφυλάττωμεν;) Cf. Plutarch, *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* 1092F. It may come as some surprise that Plutarch defends a view in which the proper training of youths can help inoculate them, so to speak, against the corrupting influences of poetic representations. Plutarch's defense of poetry's usefulness in education, especially as he defends its use against the psychological criticisms of poetry in Plato's *Republic* 10, deserves a much longer discussion, which is outside the scope of this chapter and this dissertation. My own view is that Plutarch's defense of poetry relies both on his view that moral virtue is a harmony between moderated passions and reason, not a mastery of passion that requires passions to be relatively weak, and his view that we can teach students to use discrimination to keep their own passions from becoming inordinate and misdirected. Cf. Neumayr 1963 and 1964; Zadorojnyi 2002; and Blank 2011.

[83] *On the Control of Anger*, *On Talkativeness*, *On Being a Busybody*, and *On Compliancy* respectively. Plutarch also gives advice and instruction throughout other works, such as *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend*, and *Precepts of Marriage*. Cf. Van Hoof 2010. On Plutarch's insistence that even formal education continues to help us shape spirited and appetitive desires as well as to advance in knowledge, especially in the *Lives*, cf. Swain 1990a and 1990b; Pelling 1990, pp. 213–44; Duff 1999, pp. 76–8; 2008; Gill 2006, pp. 412–21; Beneker 2012, pp. 70–1.

his audience learn to *recognize* their errors and track their progress as they work on developing virtues as far as they are able.

Much of this advice relies, once again, on a well-attuned sense of shame, the habituated spirited passions established in one's early education, in order for one to make moral improvement. Now, in addition to making one receptive and well-oriented to moderate one's own desires and passions, a sense of shame plays a greater role in *error-detection* useful for self-improvement in later stages of moral progress.[84] The sting of shame should bring error to one's attention, leading one to give more personal thought as to how one ought to live and shape one's own habits to reflect that kind of life (*On Talkativeness* 510C11–E10=[T95]; *On Listening to Lectures* 46D4–13).[85]

When it comes to detecting our own errors, Plutarch notes that for many individuals, the shameful consequences of certain types of action are not readily apparent to one before commiting the error. We often feel shame and regret retrospectively over what we have done. In such instances, shame helps us to detect error in a kind of feedback loop, indicating that *that* course led to an undesirable outcome, i.e. a shameful one. Plutarch's advice is to commit to memory the negative consequences in order to avoid making the same mistakes in the future:

[T94] ὡς γὰρ οἱ λίθῳ προσπταίσαντες ὁδοιπόροι ἢ περὶ ἄκραν ἀνατραπέντες κυβερνῆται, ἂν μνημονεύωσιν, οὐκ ἐκεῖνα μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ προσόμοια

[84] Konstan (2006, pp. 101–2) also argues that Aristotle bridges the divide between feeling ashamed of one's past actions and attempting to make amends for one's faults, since one becomes aware of one's faults because of the shame one feels over them. Although Konstan is not as explicit on the point, I take it that he also holds that in Aristotle's understanding of a sense of shame, becoming aware of our faults can be a point of error-detection used to make self-improvement to our character, as is the case for Plutarch. Cairns (1993, pp. 17–28) also seems to hint at the same use of a sense of shame for remediation of character. For a recent discussion of a sense of shame used in moral improvement in Aristotle's ethics see Raymond 2017.

In modern psychological literature, shame was for a time considered a purely self-abasing, retrospective "dark" emotion with no practical or positive prospective aspect. Cf. Linsday-Hartz, De Rivera, Mascolo 1995 and Tangney and Dearing 2002. Against this view, more recent studies such as Ferguson, Brugman, White, Eyre 2007 and Deonna, Rodogno, Teroni 2012 argue for the positive, prospective use of shame for moral self-improvement.

[85] Cf. Plato, *Symposium* 216a4–c3, wherein Alcibiades describes how Socrates causes him to feel shame (αἰσχύνεσθαι) about his own moral failing and subsequently a desire to learn to make moral improvement. Cf. also Xenophontos 2016, pp. 13–14.

> φρίττοντες καὶ φυλαττόμενοι διατελοῦσιν, οὕτως οἱ τὰ τῆς δυσωπίας αἰσχρὰ καὶ βλαβερὰ συνεχῶς τῷ μετανοοῦντι καὶ δακνομένῳ προβάλλοντες ἀντιλήψονται πάλιν ἑαυτῶν ἐν τοῖς ὁμοίοις καὶ οὐ προήσονται ῥᾳδίως ὑποφερομένους.
>
> For just as travelers, after stumbling on a stone or pilots once they have capsized round a headland, if they put it to memory, not only continue to shudder at those events and guard against them, but also from those that are like them, likewise those who consistently put the shameful and harmful deeds of their bashfulness before their change of heart and the biting sting of regret they feel will recover themselves in similar circumstances and will not give themselves up to be carried away easily.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Compliancy* 536C9–D5)

By putting to memory the harmful and shameful outcomes of certain types of actions, just as the ship captain keeps in mind the antecedent signs of danger that preceded his former shipwreck, we can guard against (φυλάττεσθαι) future dangers and shameful outcomes. There is a fearful reaction, moreover, that gets instilled within us when we see the conditions that preceded the negative results we previously experienced: we shudder with chilling fear (φρίττοντες). The emotional reaction, attended by a physical reaction of a cold chill, draws our attention to possible impending danger in future occurrences. The painful reminders of a biting pain (δηγμός) or the psychic anguish of remorse (μεταμέλεια) serve as poignant deterrents and warning signs (τὰ σημεῖα, *On Compliancy* 536C5–9).[86]

Plutarch claims that we can avoid making not only *those* same mistakes (ἐκεῖνα), but even more generally others that are *like them* (προσόμοια). We can induce a changed orientation

[86] "We ought forcefully to hold in our memory, putting within ourselves the warning signs of the painful sting and remorse, storing them up and maintaining them for the greatest extent of time" (δεῖ…ἰσχυρῶς μνημονεύειν καὶ τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ δηγμοῦ καὶ τῆς μεταμελείας θεμένους ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀναλαμβάνειν καὶ φυλάττειν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον χρόνον).

Plutarch discusses a fault of excessive shame in *On Compliancy* 536C5–9, which pertains to our moral character, but training ourselves to avoid shameful or harmful consequences need not always involve an ethical dimension aimed at improving our character or even for the sake of doing a morally upright action. The analogy he draws upon is non-moral; ship captains and wayfarers remember mistakes to avoid painful and injurious consequences. Plutarch at times uses terminology associated with moral regret (μεταμέλεια) and repentance (μετάνοια) from immoral actions and desires in non-moral senses. To feel regret may involve no more than to wish that things had turned out differently, regardless of any moral implications. Cf. Plutarch, *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men* 163F and *Cato the Younger* 7.1.4. Cf. also Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 9.4, 1166b24–5; Curzer 2012, p. 344 n. 5.

to those *types* of action by reminding ourselves of their negative consequences of harm and shame, things we naturally desire to avoid. As he notes elsewhere, this requires a rational power of reflecting on the consequences of actions:

[T95] τῶν γὰρ παθῶν κρίσει καὶ ἀσκήσει περιγινόμεθα, προτέρα δ' ἡ κρίσις ἐστίν. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐθίζεται φεύγειν καὶ ἀποτρίβεσθαι τῆς ψυχῆς ὃ μὴ δυσχεραίνει· δυσχεραίνομεν δὲ τὰ πάθη, ὅταν τὰς βλάβας καὶ τὰς αἰσχύνας τὰς ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῷ λόγῳ κατανοήσωμεν….ὥστε τοῦτο πρῶτον ἴαμα καὶ φάρμακόν ἐστι τοῦ πάθους, ὁ τῶν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γινομένων αἰσχρῶν καὶ ὀδυνηρῶν ἐπιλογισμός.

> For we overcome diseased passions through diagnosis and treatment, but the diagnosis is prior. For no one is accustomed to avoid or reject from his soul what one does not feel disgust toward, but we feel disgust for diseased passions whenever we understand through the use of reason the harm and shame that results from them.…Consequently, this is the first remedy and curative drug for excessive passion, namely, reflection on the shameful and painful effects that occur consequent to excessive passion.[87]
>
> (Plutarch, *On Talkativeness* 510C11–E10)

Diagnosis must occur first, since reason applies the treatment for the diseased passions of the soul. The strong association of shame with certain desires and actions serves as a prophylactic measure that triggers strong emotional warning and counter-motivation to avoid that course of action when the urge to act in such a way arises (*On the Control of Anger* 460C8–9; *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 420E).[88] Reflection that produces a diagnosis is, in fact, the first part of the treatment and cure for the diseased state of passionate character (πρῶτον ἴαμα καὶ φάρμακόν ἐστι τοῦ πάθους).

As in a favorite Platonic craft-analogy, shame and reflection are like medical remedies meant to spur and bring one back to normative states (*Gorgias* 464a–465e and 476a–479d). The

[87] Plutarch has thus far been discussing excessive passions, pairing passion (an excessive form) with disease (νόσος) throughout the discussion. On this distinction see §VI in Chapter 2.

[88] In *On the Control of Anger* 460C8–9, the advice for those who have a disposition to react excessively in anger or too quickly "perhaps does not appear to be a complete cure for anger, but an evasion and prophylactic against the mistakes that one makes in anger" (ἴσως οὐκ ὀργῆς ἰατρεία φανεῖται, διάκρουσις δὲ καὶ φυλακὴ τῶν ἐν ὀργῇ τινος ἁμαρτημάτων). Plutarch's point here is that the measures he has outlined thus far are only one means of treating a symptom, as he explains in 460D, but that these measures alone are only part of the treatment and will not completely remove the underlying causes themselves. Attributing the wrong to ignorance or error rather than to malevolence is given as another suggested treatment of premature wrath (*On the Control of Anger* 460D4–7).

painful procedure is part of the remedy for setting the body aright, or in the case of shame and guilt, these passions can act as a curative drug (φάρμακον) for the soul's recuperation, setting it back in the direction of restoring balance of harmonious interrelations, even as bodily health is restored through a shift that rebalances its humors back into a harmonious arrangement.

In addition, more than just remembering the associations of certain actions with shameful and painful results, reflective consideration (ἐπιλογισμός) allows one to draw inferences from causes of an action to further consequences. It is through the use of one's own reason (τῷ λόγῳ) and the capacity to observe (κατανοεῖν) and reflect on (ἐπιλογίζεσθαι) cause and effect that one begins to work on self-diagnosis and a prescribed treatment of self-correction. Rational reflection (ἐπιλογισμός), then, becomes of great importance as one matures in one's rational powers and naturally accompanies and becomes an essential component to our education in addition to habituation (*On Talkativeness* 514E3–4).[89]

Plutarch's view on the usefulness of shame for correction falls quite close to that of certain Stoics, though there is some contention among their leading figures over whether shame is appropriate.[90] For Chrysippus and his followers, a teacher can use censure to bring to light elements of bad character in others, for which they feel shame (αἰσχύνη). The distress over their failings, presumably, is intended to spur them to correct their faults and character.[91] Yet this fits

[89] "With these applications of habituation we ought always to mix in and combine attentiveness and rational reflection" (τούτοις δ' ἀεὶ δεῖ καταμεμ⟨ε⟩ῖχθαι καὶ συμπεπλέχθαι τοῖς ἐθισμοῖς τὴν προσοχὴν ἐκείνην καὶ τὸν ἐπιλογισμόν).

[90] Cleanthes, for instance, believes that an error must be present within this feeling of distress, which would make it a passion that is vicious, is to be avoided, and is not helpful for virtue. Cf. Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.77. Even Posidonius, a later Stoic, denies that anyone ever actually feels distress over the bad state of one's character (Cicero, *Academica* 1.38). Chrysippus, however, argues that the passion can be useful for those who are not yet sages. Epictetus, much later, exhorts non-sages to feel distress and shame for moral progress (*Discourses* 3.7.27; 3.19.1; 3.23.30 and 37; 4.9.10; 4.10.3). My discussion here of shame among the Stoics relies heavily on both Sorabji 2000, pp. 32 and 47–52, and Graver 2007, pp. 191–211.

[91] See Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 452C6–D1. The sage, the Stoics admit, cannot feel this emotion as he is perfect and in need of no correction, while the one who is not a sage may benefit from correction and repent due to emotional distress and remorse (Stob. 2.7.11i and 2.7.11m; cf. Seneca *On Benefits* 4.34).

uneasily with the Stoic notion that passions, which include shame, are *irrational* and misplace value. For in the case of feeling shame over one's bad character, it certainly seems that one can be correct in the estimation of one's moral standing as deficient and also be correct in seeing one's state of character as what is of ultimate value, since character is what is important for virtue. This comes out in Chrysippus' disagreement with Cleanthes on the correct use of shame (Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.77).[92] Nevertheless, Chrysippus still seems to walk a fine line in advocating the use of shame, since even in his view one still ought not to assent to this emotion, even though one can use it to spur another to correct his character.[93]

For Plutarch, however, even a painful emotion such as shame is not problematic for moral improvement. Correction of character through the use of shame fits neatly within Plutarch's moral psychology and view of moral progress. As an emotion, shame can incorporate a correct estimation of one's fault, since emotions need not be cognitively false for Plutarch. It also can serve a positive function, just like other emotions that are teleologically oriented for the good of the human soul, as the ox is fit for the plow and the horse for the yoke (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451D6–8).

Plutarch, in fact, believes that a sense of shame is so vital for error-detection in youths that he argues they have little hope of seeking or finding a means of improving the internal psychic state that led to their shameful actions unless they feel a sting of pain over the shamefulness of their deeds (Plutarch, *On Listening to Lectures* 46D4–13). Even censures by those who do not have our best intentions in mind should be taken into consideration, then, since

---

[92] Drawing on the example of Alcibiades' distress over his moral faults when confronted by Socrates, Chrysippus argues that Alcibiades' distress over character is not misplaced.

[93] Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.61, 68, 70, 77–8; 4.61. Cf. White 1995, who draws out this implication. Cf. also Sorabji 2000, p. 32 and n. 17. On the Stoic distinction between a prospective sense of shame (αἰδώς) that belongs to the sage and the retrospective shame (αἰσχύνη) felt over past faults or the state of one's character see Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 449A2–B2; Pseudo-Andronicus, *On Emotions* 6=*SVF* 3.432.

they also can help us see our own faults, provided they are correct and we take them accordingly. Words of good counsel are preferable (βέλτιον), Plutarch notes, since we can avoid making mistakes in the first place (τὰς ἁμαρτίας φυλάττεσθαι). Nevertheless, censures of those who hate us can be put to our benefit, if they help us to diagnose our own problems and change our behavior (μετανοεῖν, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 74C7–D1).[94] This requires some discernment and reflection on our part in deciding how we are to be affected by the praise and blame of others, deciding whether or not it is warranted and apt.

§V Anchoring the Sense of Shame to Reason

Because shame is a such a powerful tool in persuading others to act or change their course of action, Plutarch also highlights the importance of having a firm foundation for discriminating the appropriateness of censure and blame. We must be discerning not only in determining how we receive and use the censures of our enemies, but also our loved ones whose advice and admonitions may still be in error. To avoid being blown about to negative effect, reason must become, as it were, the anchor to our passions (ὡς ἄγκιστρον ἀγκύρας), including the passions of shame and regret (*To an Uneducated Ruler* 782D7–E10; *On the Control of Anger* 460A10–B10).[95] Through a set of well-established reasons for action, we come to anchor our

[94] "We see even enemies make use of censures of what one has done against each other, just as Diogenes used to say that one who intends to be saved must have good friends or ardent enemies, since the former teach while the latter find our faults. But, it is better to guard against making mistakes by listening to those who give us counsel than it is to repent of our mistakes because of those who malign us" (τῷ δὲ ψέγειν τὰ πραχθέντα καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς κατ' ἀλλήλων ὁρῶμεν χρωμένους, ὥσπερ Διογένης ἔλεγεν ὅτι τῷ μέλλοντι σώζεσθαι δεῖ φίλους ἀγαθοὺς ἢ διαπύρους ἐχθροὺς ὑπάρχειν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ διδάσκουσιν, οἱ δ' ἐλέγχουσι. βέλτιον δὲ τὰς ἁμαρτίας φυλάττεσθαι τοῖς συμβουλεύουσι πειθόμενον ἢ μετανοεῖν ἁμαρτόντα διὰ τοὺς κακῶς λέγοντας).

[95] *To an Uneducated Ruler* 782D7–E10: "'For spirit yields and does not resist [the temptation to retaliate immediately], *like the hook of an anchor* in the sand battered by tossing waves' [*Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Adespota fr. 379 Kannicht and Snell] if reason does not check and press its power with weight" ("εἴκει γὰρ ἤδη θυμὸς οὐδ' ἔτ' ἀντέχει,/ θινῶδες ὡς ἄγκιστρον ἀγκύρας σάλῳ" ἂν μὴ βάρος ἔχων ὁ λογισμὸς ἐπιθλίβῃ καὶ πιέζῃ τὴν ἐξουσίαν). For the quotation, see also *On Moral Virtue* 446A11–12, where Plutarch likewise compares spirited reaction opposed to rational judgment as a passion unhinged from the better judgment of the rational part of the soul.

sense of shame to what we ought, so that we are not swept away or persuaded by others contrary to our own better judgment.

In several examples at the beginning of this chapter, I highlighted how shame can be used as a tool to lead others toward a better end. In Plutarch's biographical work on *Timoleon*, we find that infirmity of conviction can leave one vulnerable to the manipulation of passions set to a worse end. Plutarch recounts that Timoleon served and protected his brother so long as he fought for their country, but when his brother plotted against the city and enslaved it, Timoleon slew him (5.1–2). Though Timoleon chose to do what was honorable, Plutarch explains, since he put the interests of the city above his own kin, Timoleon nonetheless *later* gave in to censure and blame from his fellow citizens, who reviled him as though he had committed an unholy and abominable deed (λοιδοροῦντες, ὡς ἀσεβὲς ἐξειργασμένον καὶ μυσῶδες ἔργον), and to his mother's disgust for him because he killed her son, his tyrannical brother. Afterwards, Timoleon became despondent, full of grief, and, as Plutarch surmises, accomplished nothing of worth for a long period of time (5.3–4).

Plutarch presents Timoleon as a negative example whom we ought not to emulate:

[T96] οὕτως αἱ κρίσεις, ἂν μὴ βεβαιότητα καὶ ῥώμην ἐκ λόγου καὶ φιλοσοφίας προσλάβωσιν ἐπὶ τὰς πράξεις, σείονται καὶ παραφέρονται ῥᾳδίως ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων ἐπαίνων καὶ ψόγων ἐκκρουόμεναι τῶν οἰκείων λογισμῶν.

> And so our judgments, if they do not receive stability and strength from reason and philosophy toward practical ends, are shaken and are moved in the wrong direction easily by praise and blame from people we meet with at random, knocked out of their own rational calculations. (Plutarch, *Timoleon* 6.1–2)

Plutarch explains that Timoleon came to regret that he chose the right course of action as the representation of what was noble faded away (ἀπομαραινομένης τῆς τοῦ καλοῦ φαντασίας, 6.4). As in the example from *Demosthenes* and *Pericles* in §I above, he was brought to a change of heart through passion, even against his own rational calculations, overcome with shame due to

the imposition of blame by others, shaken and led astray (σείονται καὶ παραφέρονται).

In his closing remarks, Plutarch writes that standing firm with one's choice of action despite blame from outside is "characteristic of perhaps a greater and more complete virtue" (ἴσως μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας ἀρετῆς ἐστι, 6.7), which Timoleon would have exemplified if he had been more firm in holding to his convictions.[96] This higher virtue is characteristic of a soul that has been trained to hold fast to correct convictions that have been reflected upon and informed by philosophical investigation (ἐκ λόγου καὶ φιλοσοφίας, *Timoleon* 6.1–2=[T96] and 6.4[97]). The early childhood training in shame is not sufficient but must be further developed through reflection and higher education if we are to steel ourselves against emotional manipulation and develop a more stable character.[98]

We must become adept at guiding our actions through practical wisdom (φρόνησις), the optimal state of practical reason (πρακτικὸς λόγος, *On Moral Virtue* 444A3–B1),[99] to develop a

---

[96] Plutarch presents an example of this higher virtue with Metellus in *Marius* 29.8–9. Marius and Saturninus set a trap for Metellus: they try to incur hatred against Metellus, knowing that he would refuse to abide by the additional clause of a proposed agrarian law, which would require the members of the Senate to take an oath binding them to follow without opposition whatever the people decided by vote (*Marius* 29.1–8). Metellus, as expected, refused to take the oath. Metellus thereafter is sentenced to punishment and though his friends beg him to change his mind and swear the oath, "remaining steadfast in his character and preparing to suffer everything dreadful on the condition that he committed no shameful deed, he departed from the forum, saying to those around him that to do an evil deed is base and to do something honorable when there is no risk is common, but to do honorable deeds in the midst of dangers is a quality peculiar to a good man" (ἐμμένων τῷ ἤθει καὶ πᾶν παθεῖν δεινὸν ἐπὶ τῷ μηθὲν αἰσχρὸν ἐργάσασθαι παρεσκευασμένος, ἀπῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς, διαλεγόμενος τοῖς περὶ αὐτόν, ὡς τὸ κακόν τι πρᾶξαι φαῦλον εἴη, τὸ δὲ καλὸν μέν, ἀκινδύνως δὲ κοινόν, ἴδιον δ' ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ τὸ μετὰ κινδύνων τὰ καλὰ πράσσειν). Metellus thus exemplifies a steadfast, stable commitment to what he sees as honorable, in spite of censure, dangers, and punishment. Plutarch provides another example in *On Brotherly Love* 484B, where Athenodorus is praised for being generous to his brother, even though his brother squandered his half of the inheritance. Athenodorus divides his own portion equally with his brother without vexation or a later change of heart (μετάνοια), despite the potential shame he could incur for helping his brother.

[97] See n. 100 below.

[98] See Plutarch, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 52F5–7: "Thus was Plato of such a character in Syracuse as he was in the Academy, and toward Dionysius he was the same in character as toward Dion" (οὕτω καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Συρακούσαις οἷος ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ, καὶ πρὸς Διονύσιον οἷος πρὸς Δίωνα). Cf. *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 52A1–5, 11–12. Stability as a key component of virtuous character is often revealed by contrast with instability of character in Plato. Cf. *Lysis* 214d; *Republic* 1, 352a; 7, 535a–538e; and *Gorgias* 481e. Among the Stoics, stable character is not led astray by the persuasion of false impressions but holds fast to convictions of what is good or bad. Cf. Epictetus, *Discourses* 2.22.6 and 25. For a general discussion on the importance of character stability in virtue ethics see Kamtekar 2004, esp. pp. 482–3.

[99] =[T47] in Chapter 3. See Chapter 3, §I.

stable policy that guides our actions (προαίρεσις, *Timoleon* 6.4).[100] The same would be true for any soul so lucky as to be well-endowed with good and ordinate passions from birth. As we will see in Plutarch's metaphor of cultivating plants in the following chapter, even such "natural virtue" would be insufficient, since it provides good potential for development but can easily be corrupted toward vice as well as cultivated for virtue.[101]

***

By focusing on the positive contributions that spirited emotions make in Plutarch's view of ethical education, I hope to have illumined yet another motivation for Plutarch's positive evaluation of non-rational passions. In addition to adding drive and enhancing action, non-rational passions, particularly spirited emotions, also serve an important role in providing a naturally good disposition to advance toward virtue (εὐφυΐα), which we can use to develop good character. Not only do passions lie at the beginning of our journey on the path to virtue, making them crucial to our early education, but they also help us to continue on that path and to continue to make progress toward virtue.

[100] Plutarch describes stable policy for action as arising from knowledge and calculation (ἡ δ᾽ ἐξ ἐπιστήμης ὡρμημένη καὶ λογισμοῦ προαίρεσις). See the following note on the connection with Aristotle's view.

[101] The notion of natural virtue crops up in Plutarch's *Beasts are Rational*, where Gryllus, Odysseus' former comrade turned into a pig endowed with speech by Circe, argues that animals are superior to humans because they naturally exhibit virtuous actions without being taught or habituated (987A–B and F). Yet even Gryllus in that passage notes that animals can be corrupted (987D–E). This brings the discussion of natural virtue in this text close to the Aristotelian conception in *Politics* 7.13, 1332A40–B3, where Aristotle describes natural virtue more as a natural disposition that is indeterminate and able to be shaped toward virtue or corrupted toward vice. In *Nicomachean Ethics* 6.13, 1144b1–1145a11, Aristotle distinguishes natural virtue from virtue in the full sense, which requires practical wisdom (φρόνησις) and knowledge to produce stable policy that guides actions (προαίρεσις). Cf. *ibid*. 3.8, 1116b24–1117a1. For further discussion of natural virtue in Aristotle's works cf. also Sorabji 1973, esp. pp. 120–2; White 1992; Pakaluk 1992, esp. pp. 176–7; Kamtekar 2004, p. 480; Dominick 2006; Curzer 2012, pp. 341–66. Cf. Plato, *Laws* 6, 765e3–766a4, which describes natural virtue as a certain passionate endowment useful for moving toward virtue. In Plato's *Republic* (7, 518d–e), however, the so-called virtues from one's early education come about through teaching and habituation, not on their own. In the *Laches* (197a–b), virtue is denied not only to animals, but also to children on the grounds that they lack sufficient understanding.

CHAPTER 6

Cultivating Virtue and Becoming Like God

We have already explored a number of arguments and several vivid metaphors that Plutarch uses to highlight his positive evaluation of passions. In the first section of this chapter, we will explore Plutarch's metaphor of cultivating passions. Like a field that is fertile for the cultivation of a fruitful crop, the human soul is full of different passions that can be developed toward virtue. Yet, also like a field full of different kinds of growth, there are weeds that can overshadow and choke out fruit-bearing crops, i.e. natural inclinations toward vice within our passionate nature that can stifle the good passions from being fully developed in the right manner. The formation of virtuous character, then, requires the cultivation of passions, promoting the growth of good passions that lead to virtue while removing or curbing bad inclinations and passions that lead to corruption and vice. In this metaphor, Plutarch highlights the good aspects of our passionate nature that contain the potential to grow and develop virtue as their fruit (§I).

Together with this plant metaphor, Plutarch, in contrast with a number of his predecessors, including Plato, identifies certain passions as the seeds of virtue. The passion of affection (φιλοστοργία) plays a particularly important role for Plutarch as the seed that bears the fruit of justice. Drawing on the model of Stoic οἰκείωσις, Plutarch describes the foundations of our social lives with the seed of affection. Starting with affection between parents and offspring, we begin to identify with other human beings more generally in an outward extension, sharing

others' cares and concerns. Unlike in the Stoic account, a non-rational passion initiates this outward movement and permeates all of our human social relations (§II–§III).

In the final section of this chapter (§IV), I argue that Plutarch appropriates a form of οἰκείωσις from the Stoics and unites it with the Platonic ideal of becoming like god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ). In the process of adapting these theories into his own philosophical worldview, he places passions at the center of moral progress and incorporates them into the good life. First, by modifying a form of οἰκείωσις from what we find in the Stoics, Plutarch indicates that passions are fundamental to moral development from our inception and through all social interactions up to the formation of just relations with others. This form of affiliation and identification corrects the shortcomings of the Stoic model for Plutarch, since it allows for genuine concern for others through emotional vulnerability, unlike the isolation and alienation from others and from one's passionate nature that Plutarch criticizes as the Stoic goal of becoming an invulnerable Stoic sage (Chapter 1). Though the non-rational passion of affection initiates our affiliation and identification with others, it is insufficient to account for how humans become fully virtuous.

For the fulfillment of human nature, Plutarch adapts a form of the Platonic goal in which human nature becomes complete in becoming like god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ). Far from holding that becoming like god entails "flight" from this world or becoming other-worldly, as some interpretations of both Plato's dialogues and his followers suggest, Plutarch holds that we become like god while remaining fully human as moral agents. This includes maintaining and developing our passionate nature. For Plutarch, becoming like god involves practical action and engagement with this world, attempting, like the Demiurge in the *Timaeus*, to make the world the best that it can be.

§I Character Formation and the Metaphor of Cultivation

As we will explore in this section, Plutarch understands the human propensity to pursue virtue as growing from our passionate nature, like plants in fertile soil.[1] Before discussing the positive features of this metaphor and the natural goodness for growth and development toward virtue (εὐφυΐα), we will look at several passages in which Plutarch highlights the ambivalence of our early nature that can grow to be fruitful for virtue or stifled by weeds that lead to vice.

§I.a. Cultivating Virtue: Plant Metaphors, Passions, and Pruning the Desire for Honor

Together with a natural aptitude and sensitivity to develop our nature toward virtue, evidenced by the goodness to grow toward virtue (εὐφυΐα),[2] Plutarch holds that we also have natural tendencies to become vicious. "Human nature" (ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις), Plutarch writes, "does not produce any character indisputably oriented toward virtue" (οὐδ᾽ ἀναμφισβήτητον εἰς ἀρετὴν ἦθος γεγονὸς ἀποδίδωσιν, *Cimon* 2.5). Progress in virtue (προκοπή) occurs between the starting-point (ἀρχή) of our naturally good potential to develop toward virtue (εὐφυΐα) and its fulfillment (τέλος, *Table-Talk* 636B2–6),[3] but that natural process is no guarantee of success.

Our passionate nature is, as Plutarch frequently describes it, a field full of *different kinds* of plants. Certain passions and natural impulses blossom into virtue while others, like weeds,

---

[1] See Ray 2010 for a brief overview on the centrality of farming in the literatures of Greece and Rome and the frequent use of farming as a metaphor in reflections on human nature and virtue.

[2] See Plutarch, *Bravery of Women* 249C7–11=[T84] in Chapter 5. See also the discussion of εὐφυΐα and spirited emotions in Chapter 5, including n. 20.

[3] Discussing the proverbial question of whether the chicken or the egg came first, Plutarch's interlocutor, Firmus, says, "And in general *the starting-point is first and the seed is the starting-point*, but the egg is larger than the seed but smaller than the animal, for, as *progress seems to be between goodness of natural growth and virtue*, so is the egg a certain progress of the nature toward the ensouled being from the seed that is progressing" (καθόλου δ᾽ ἡ μὲν ἀρχὴ πρῶτον, ἀρχὴ δὲ τὸ σπέρμα, τὸ δ᾽ ᾠὸν σπέρματος μὲν πλέον, ζῴου δὲ μικρότερον· ὡς γὰρ ἡ προκοπὴ μέσον εὐφυΐας εἶναι δοκεῖ καὶ ἀρετῆς, οὕτω τὸ ᾠὸν προκοπή τίς ἐστι τῆς φύσεως ἐπὶ τὸ ἔμψυχον ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος πορευομένης). Cf. Roskam 2004a.

lead to the corruption of the garden's fruitful crop. Our souls need cultivation to protect and promote the right kinds of passions while, as it were, weeding out and stifling vicious inclinations and bad growth.

On the ambivalent potential of one's passionate nature, the characters of Alcibiades and Marcius Coriolanus serve as poignant examples in Plutarch's *Lives*. Although Alcibiades was full of promise in his nature to develop a virtuous character (πρὸς ἀρετὴν εὐφυΐα, *Alcibiades* 4.1),[4] Socrates nonetheless failed to counteract the negative aspects of Alcibiades' passionate nature, since his nature was full of bad impulses as well as good (*Alcibiades* 2.1). Socrates approached Alcibiades like a farmer:

[T97] οἷος ἦν ἀμύνειν καὶ μὴ περιορᾶν ὥσπερ φυτὸν ἐν ἄνθει τὸν οἰκεῖον καρπὸν ἀποβάλλον καὶ διαφθεῖρον.

> He [Socrates] intended to ward off [flatterers and corrupting influences] and not to allow him [Alcibiades], like a plant in bloom, to cast off his own fruit and lose it.
> (Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 4.1)

Despite these efforts to cultivate and protect Alcibiades, like a plant with great potential to blossom into an upright character, the negative aspects of Alcibiades' nature overcame the good, and the roots of corruption won out in the end.[5]

Plutarch characterizes Marcius Coriolanus similarly, relating that he was born with a nature full of potential for great good as well as great corruption:

[T98] ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ ἐμαρτύρησε καὶ τοῖς τὴν φύσιν ἡγουμένοις, ἐὰν οὖσα γενναία καὶ ἀγαθὴ παιδείας ἐνδεὴς γένηται, πολλὰ τοῖς χρηστοῖς ὁμοῦ φαῦλα συναποτίκτειν, ὥσπερ εὐγενῆ χώραν ἐν γεωργίᾳ θεραπείας μὴ τυχοῦσαν.

> The same man also gave evidence to those who consider that nature, if it lacks education, even if it is noble and good, produces a great deal that is bad along with what is good, like a fertile plot of soil that fails to get any agricultural cultivation.

---

[4] "Socrates' love was a great witness to the boy's *natural propensity to grow toward virtue*" (ὁ δὲ Σωκράτους ἔρως μέγα μαρτύριον ἦν τῆς πρὸς ἀρετὴν εὐφυΐας τοῦ παιδός), i.e. Socrates' interest in Alcibiades was proof that he recognized in Alcibiades' nature a great potential to grow toward virtue.

[5] On Alcibiades' corruption by other would-be lovers (ἐρασταί) in Plutarch cf. Lucchesi 2013.

(Plutarch, *Coriolanus* 1.3)

As with Alcibiades, Coriolanus' fertile nature revealed the ambivalence present in how one's character can develop.[6] Without proper education and rearing, like an untilled plot of soil, the soul is ripe for vice as well as virtue.

More generally, in *Dialogue on Love*, we are told that the gods do not ensure that the rearing and education of children and boys leads on a straight path to virtue without a caretaker (κηδεμών) to guard the best part within them from corruption:

[T99] μειρακίων δ' ἄρα καὶ παίδων ἐν ὥρᾳ καὶ ἄνθει πλαττομένων καὶ ῥυθμιζομένων τροφαὶ καὶ αὐξήσεις οὐδενὶ θεῶν ἢ δαιμόνων προσήκουσιν, οὐδ' ἔστιν ᾧ μέλει φυόμενον ἄνθρωπον εἰς ἀρετὴν ὀρθὸν ἐλθεῖν καὶ μὴ παρατραπῆναι μηδὲ κλασθῆναι τὸ γενναῖον ἐρημίᾳ κηδεμόνος ἢ κακίᾳ τῶν προστυγχανόντων.

> The nurture and growth of boys and children when they are being shaped and trained in their due season and at the time of their blossoming does not belong to any god or divine spirit, nor does it belong to any one of them to take concern over whether a human, in the process of growing toward virtue, comes to it on a straight path without deviating nor that the noble part of him is not crushed for lack of a caretaker or due to the vice of those whom one encounters. (Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love* 757F3–759A2)

The noble portion of our nature (τὸ γενναῖον) must be *protected*, like a young plant, and allowed to grow toward virtue (φυόμενον εἰς ἀρετήν), since, once again, the presence of a good nature does not assure success without cultivation and a cultivator. The gods do not guarantee that human souls produce a crop of virtue without toil, unlike the Cyclopean fields that give their fruit without planting or sowing due to divine blessing (*Beasts are Rational* 986F1–B10).[7]

---

[6] Cf. also *Demetrius* 1.7, where Plutarch remarks that Plato's saying "that great natures produce great vices even as they do virtues" (ὅτι καὶ κακίας μεγάλας, ὥσπερ ἀρετάς, αἱ μεγάλαι φύσεις ἐκφέρουσι) shown in Demetrius and Antony. For the saying, Plutarch seems to have in mind Plato, *Republic* 6, 491d4–492a5. Cf. Duff 1999, p. 48.

[7] In his argument with Gryllus, Odysseus's former comrade turned into a pig and endowed with speech, Odysseus concedes that *if* the souls of beasts produce virtue without toil, cultivation, or hard work, they would be in a preferable and superior state over humans who must work to develop their passions toward virtue. In the passage, Gryllus asserts: "The soul of beasts…without commands and untaught, as though unsown and unploughed, naturally produces and makes to grow the virtue that befits each" (ἡ τῶν θηρίων ψυχή… ἀνεπίτακτος γὰρ καὶ ἀδίδακτος ὥσπερ ἄσπορος καὶ ἀνήροτος ἐκφέρει καὶ αὔξει κατὰ φύσιν τὴν ἑκάστῳ προσήκουσαν ἀρετήν). Their nature, Gryllus argues, produces virtue like the Cyclopean fields and unlike the rough terrain of Odysseus' home in Ithaca, which, like the human soul, requires arduous cultivation. See also §VII of Chapter 4.

Guiding souls to grow in virtue is a human endeavor. The cultivation of the human soul must be undertaken with foresight and diligence, tending to the young to promote the right kind of growth through education and good upbringing (*Lycurgus and Numa* 4.4–5[8] and *Numa* 6.2–4[9]).

Plutarch also interweaves images of medical intervention with the metaphor of cultivating passions. In addition to the pruning of passions to grow in the right direction, the hard work of cultivating the passionate part of the soul partially consists in weeding out the field of bad impulses and desires, like a medical practitioner removing diseased tissue with a knife:

[T100] ὡς γὰρ ὁ γεωργὸς ἄγριον μὲν ἐκκόπτων βλάστημα καὶ ἀγεννὲς αὐτόθεν ἀφειδῶς ἐμβαλὼν τὸ σκαφεῖον ἀνέτρεψε τὴν ῥίζαν ἢ πῦρ προσαγαγὼν ἐπέκαυσεν, ἀμπέλῳ δὲ προσιὼν τομῆς δεομένῃ καὶ μηλέας ἤ τινος ἐλαίας ἁπτόμενος εὐλαβῶς ἐπιφέρει τὴν χεῖρα, δεδιὼς μή τι τοῦ ὑγιαίνοντος ἀποτυφλώσῃ, οὕτως ὁ φιλόσοφος φθόνον μὲν ἐξαιρῶν νέου ψυχῆς, ἀγεννὲς βλάστημα καὶ δυστιθάσευτον, ἢ φιλαργυρίαν ἄωρον ἢ φιληδονίαν ἐπικόπτων ἀκόλαστον αἱμάσσει καὶ πιέζει καὶ τομὴν ποιεῖ καὶ οὐλὴν βαθεῖαν· ὅταν δὲ τρυφερῷ μέρει ψυχῆς καὶ ἁπαλῷ κολούοντα προσαγάγῃ λόγον, οἷόν ἐστι τὸ δυσωπούμενον καὶ διατρεπόμενον, εὐλαβεῖται μὴ λάθῃ τούτοις συναποκόψας τὸ αἰδούμενον.

For as the farmer when cutting out wild and bad growth rips up the root on the spot by unsparingly pushing the spade into the ground or burns it up by applying fire to it, but when he comes to a vine that needs to be pruned and grabs hold of some apple tree or olive tree, he carefully puts his hand upon it for fear lest he cut some bud out of what is healthy, in the same way the philosopher when he removes envy from the soul of a young man, a bad and hard-to-manage growth, or when he cuts out the unbridled love of wealth and addiction to pleasure, he draws blood, presses hard, and makes a cut and deep scar, but whenever he applies a word of discipline to the soft and delicate part of the soul, such as what becomes compliant and bashful, he is careful not to unknowingly cut out together with these [compliancy and bashfulness] a sense of shame.

(Plutarch, *On Compliancy* 529A10–C2)

[8] "And when a wise man receives the office of rule from a people recently brought together and resistant toward nothing, what was the first thing that was appropriate for him to be zealous about other than the *upbringing and training of children and youths*, namely, to see to it that there should be no confusing differences in their characters, but that they, being molded and shaped from the beginning, would walk together with one another on one common path of virtue straightway from the beginning?" (ἀνδρὶ δὲ σοφῷ βασιλείαν παραλαβόντι δήμου νεωστὶ συνισταμένου καὶ πρὸς μηδὲν ἀντιτείνοντος, περὶ τί πρῶτον ἦν σπουδάσαι προσῆκον ἢ παίδων ἐκτροφὴν καὶ νέων ἄσκησιν, ὅπως μὴ διάφοροι μηδὲ ταραχώδεις γένοιντο τοῖς ἤθεσιν, ἀλλ' εἰς ἕν τι κοινὸν ἀρετῆς ἴχνος εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς πλαττόμενοι καὶ τυπούμενοι συμβαίνοιεν ἀλλήλοις;)

[9] To the wise man, rulership offers the opportunity to cultivate virtues among the people, like a field ripe for noble and great deeds (ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ πράξεων καλῶν καὶ μεγάλων οὖσαν χώραν).

Both the farmer and doctor alike promote growth of what is fruitful and healthy by removing what starves out good growth (*To an Uneducated Ruler* 779F3–6[10]).[11] Vice, as Plutarch explains elsewhere, is like a festering cancer that works to pervert one's character as a whole, leading one down a path antithetical to that of virtuous development.[12] Like farming and medicine, cultivation of passions is an art (τέχνη) aimed at guiding and promoting the development of the right kind of character.[13]

---

[10] "But reason derived from philosophy, when it becomes established as the counselor and guardian of a ruler, removing what is dangerous from his power, just as though removing what is dangerous from a good condition, it leaves health behind [within him]" (ὁ δ' ἐκ φιλοσοφίας τῷ ἄρχοντι πάρεδρος καὶ φύλαξ ἐγκατοικισθεὶς λόγος, ὥσπερ εὐεξίας τῆς δυνάμεως τὸ ἐπισφαλὲς ἀφαιρῶν, ἀπολείπει τὸ ὑγιαῖνον).

[11] Cf. Philo, *On the Life of Abraham* 220–3: Bad passions grow and choke out what is healthy in the soul. As White (2008, p. 292, n. 52) notes, Philo's use of παρευημερεῖν in this passage evokes the imagery of a tree or weed that grows up over and blocks other plants from the sun's rays. In the allegorical interpretation of Genesis 9.20 in *On Agriculture* 9–18, Philo also takes Noah to have become a farmer of the soul who weeds out evil desires and passions. Cf. also the Parable of the Sower in the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew 13.1–9 and 18–23; Mark 4.1–9 and 13–20; Luke 8.4–8 and 11–15), where worries, the deception of wealth, and other desires (ἐπιθυμίαι) are described as thorny weeds (ἄκανθαι) that choke out (συμ-/ἀπο- πνίγειν) good growth.

[12] *Whether the Affections of the Soul are Worse Than Those of the Body*; *On Listening to Lectures* 39D8–10 (quoted in n. 25 below), 43D3–44B5: "If something within oneself causes distress and is in need of urgent attention, namely a passion or disease that needs to be pressed down or assuaged" ([ἂν] τι τῶν ἰδίων ἐνοχλῇ καὶ κατεπείγῃ πάθος ἐπισχέσεως δεόμενον ἢ νόσημα παρηγορίας, 43D7–8), one ought to treat it (θεραπεύειν, 43D11), since these passions are like festering sores (ὕπουλοι, 44A9). Cf. *On Listening to Lectures* 46E1–47A10; *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 551D4–8: "The nobility of their souls, though it is strong and not faded in its natural roots, gives bloom to vice contrary to their nature, since the nobility of their nature has been corrupted by bad nurturing and bad company, but thereafter, if this nobility in some is well attended to medically, it takes back its fitting stable disposition" (τὸ γενναῖον ὡς ἰσχυρὸν αὐταῖς καὶ οὐκ ἐξίτηλον ἐμπέφυκεν, ἐξανθεῖ δὲ τὴν κακίαν παρὰ φύσιν ὑπὸ τροφῆς καὶ ὁμιλίας φαύλης φθειρόμενον, εἶτα θεραπευθὲν ἐνίοις καλῶς ἀπολαμβάνει τὴν προσήκουσαν ἕξιν). Cf. also *On Love*=Sandbach frr. 134–36 (Stob. 4.20.34 and 4.20.68): The root of the passion of ἔρως (ῥίζωσις τοῦ πάθους) is not found in sight or in spending time together with a beloved (fr. 134). Its beginning is a desire (τὸ ἀρχόμενον ἐπιθυμίαν εἶναι). Yet we have some responsibility in how we allow the seed of ἔρως to take root and grow within our souls. Concerning certain forms of ἔρως that are excessive and misdirected "it would be best not to receive the seed and starting-point of such a passion from the beginning, but if it is generated within, go to the altars of the apotropaic gods, as Plato says, go to converse and spend time with wise men, drive the beast out of yourself before its claws and fangs grow. Failing that, you will war against the evil in its final form, taking this child and infant into the fold of your arms. And what are the claws and fangs of love? Suspicion, jealousy" (διὸ κράτιστον μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοιούτου πάθους σπέρμα μὴ παραδέχεσθαι μηδ' ἀρχήν· ἂν δ' ἐγγένηται, ἴθι ἐπὶ ἀποτροπαίων βωμοὺς θεῶν κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα, ἴθι ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν συνουσίας, ἐξέλασον αὐτοῦ τὸ θηρίον πρὶν ὄνυχας φῦσαι καὶ ὀδόντας· εἰ δὲ μή, μαχέσῃ τελείῳ κακῷ, τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο καὶ νήπιον ἐναγκαλιζόμενος. τίνες δ' εἰσὶν οἱ τοῦ ἔρωτος ὄνυχες καὶ ὀδόντες; ὑποψία, ζηλοτυπία, fr. 136). See also n. 106 in Chapter 2.

[13] Cf. Plato, *Theaetetus* 149e1–4: "Do you suppose that the cultivation and harvesting of crops from the soil belongs to the same *art* as the discernment of what type of soil a certain type of plant and seed must be sown into or do you think it belongs to another one?" (τῆς αὐτῆς ἢ ἄλλης οἴει τέχνης εἶναι θεραπείαν τε καὶ συγκομιδὴν τῶν ἐκ γῆς καρπῶν καὶ αὖ τὸ γιγνώσκειν εἰς ποίαν γῆν ποῖον φυτόν τε καὶ σπέρμα καταβλητέον;). Cf. Plato, *Euthydemus* 291e8–a2. Cf. also Philo, who refers to the art of farming (τέχνη γεωργική) in *On the Creation of the*

The other point that comes at the end of the quotation is how important it is to *preserve* the roots of one's *sense of shame* (τὸ αἰδούμενον) along with other useful passions that are developed into virtuous dispositions. This fits, once more, with Plutarch's view that the sign of a natural propensity to develop in virtue (εὐφυΐα) is the presence of an appropriate sense of shame and desire for honor (*Bravery of Women* 249C7–11(=[T84] in Chapter 5)), the noble portion (τὸ γενναῖον) of our passionate nature that we should preserve and whose growth we should foster (*Dialogue on Love* 757F3–759A2=[T99]). This passion is so vital to our development that Plutarch considers its protection and correct formation to be the most important aspect and foundation to our education in virtue (*On Moral Virtue* 452D8–12=[T87] in Chapter 5). He even writes that a soul that loses its sense of shame is like a calloused bit of flesh that cannot be brought back to health (*On Listening to Lectures* 46D4–13).

We can lose (ἀπολλύειν) the strength and health of this sense of shame through neglect and corruption (*On Listening to Lectures* 46E5; cf. *Coriolanus* 1.2[14]). Alternatively, if it grows incorrectly, even this noble part of the soul can "give bloom to vice contrary to its nature by being corrupted due to bad upbringing and influence" (ἐξανθεῖ δὲ τὴν κακίαν παρὰ φύσιν ὑπὸ τροφῆς καὶ ὁμιλίας φαύλης φθειρόμενον, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 551D5–6).

Promotion of good growth sometimes involves not only protecting the noble portion (τὸ γενναῖον) of our passionate nature, but also *pruning* (τομή) certain passions of that noble portion to grow in the right direction (*On Compliancy* 529A10–C2=T[100]). In some individuals, Plutarch notes, especially those with vigorous natures in their youth (*Precepts of*

World 81, *That the Worse Attacks the Better* 104, 105, 109, 111, *On Agriculture* 4, 7, 20, 181, *On Noah's Work as a Planter* 1, 94; *On the Migration of Abraham* 55; and *On Flight and Finding* 170.

[14] Base men (φαῦλοι) are perverted in their nature and corrupt due to neglect (ὡς ἀμελείᾳ διαφθείρουσα).

Statecraft 819F2–820A2),[15] one's desire for honor must be pruned like plants that are prone to overtake their due space in one's garden of passions, since the desire for honor can be overpowering and prevail over one's other passions (πάντων ἐπικρατοῦσα τῶν παθῶν, *Cimon* 17.9). In the examples of both Alcibiades and Coriolanus, for instance, a desire for honor and ambition (φιλοτιμία) inspired not only valiant deeds, but also, in excess, led to vice. Alcibiades' corrupt character, in fact, developed from his strong impulses toward competitiveness and his ambition for supremacy, which grew excessive at the expense of a true sense of honor and moderation (*Alcibiades* 2.1).[16] As Plutarch writes elsewhere, one's love of reputation can cloud and confuse one's view of what is actually honorable (τὸ καλόν):

[T101] τὸ δ' ἄγαν πανταχοῦ μὲν ἐπισφαλές, ἐν δὲ ταῖς πολιτικαῖς φιλοτιμίαις ὀλέθριον. ἐκφέρει γὰρ εἰς μανίαν καὶ παραφροσύνην ὕπαιθρον ἐξουσίας μεγάλης ἐπιλαβομένους, ὅταν μὴ τὸ καλὸν ἔνδοξον εἶναι θέλωσιν, ἀλλ' ἀγαθὸν ἡγῶνται τὸ ἔνδοξον εἶναι.

> Excess is dangerous everywhere, but in political ambitions, it is deadly. For, out in the view of all, it brings those who lay hold of great power to madness and folly whenever they do not desire what is honorable to be glorious, but suppose that what is glorious is good. (Plutarch, *Agis and Cleomenes* 2.2)

Such a misguided view of honor develops as one becomes addicted to praise and reputation, taking these to be good and desirable in themselves, not as a sign that one's deeds are noble and an indication of one's virtue (*Agis and Cleomenes* 1.1 and 2.1).[17]

Taken correctly, however, praise can be confirmation of one's development of virtue and

---

[15] The desire for honor (φιλοτιμία) that is full of daring (τολμᾶν) "is not innate in sluggish or humble characters, but in those that are especially strong and youthful in their zeal" (ἐμφύεται γὰρ οὐκ ἀργαῖς οὐδὲ ταπειναῖς ἀλλ' ἐρρωμέναις μάλιστα καὶ νεανικαῖς προαιρέσεσι). This passion can become hard-to-manage (δυσμεταχείριστον) and difficult-to-control (ἀκατάσχετον) if not attended to early on in one's youth. On προαίρεσις as equivalent to σπουδή here see LSJ, s.v. προαίρεσις, 8.

[16] "Though he was by nature full of many great passions, the strongest was his love of victory and his ambition for supremacy" (φύσει δὲ πολλῶν ὄντων καὶ μεγάλων παθῶν ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ φιλόνικον ἰσχυρότατον ἦν καὶ τὸ φιλόπρωτον).

[17] Plutarch remarks at the beginning of *Coriolanus* that such a confusion is evident even in the Romans' use of *virtus* for virtue, which hints at the Roman fixation on manliness, victory, and courage (ἀνδρεία) as the preeminent and central cases of human virtue (1.4).

can kindle one's growth toward virtue (αὔξονται ἐπαιρόμεναι, *Agis and Cleomenes* 2.3).[18] The love of honor (φιλοτιμία) is even listed as one of the "grips of philosophy" (*On Moral Virtue* 452D3–8).[19] Additionally, other spirited emotions associated with the love of honor, including the love of competition (τὸ φιλόνεικον) and rivalry (ζῆλος), can be used as an incentive to virtue (ὑπέκκαυμα τῆς ἀρετῆς, *Agesilaus* 5.3–4),[20] as I discussed in Chapter 3 with the following examples: one's competition for honor can be channeled into a greater drive to better oneself, like horses that run faster when yoked together than when alone, we can be encouraged by the partnership in the race to do good deeds and become virtuous individuals (*Pelopidas* 19.4). One can even enter into rivaly with oneself (ζῆλος αὐτοῦ),[21] which can be directed entirely toward one's own moral progress without resorting to a comparison of oneself with others (*How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 72D2–4).[22] Rivarly with oneself avoids the temptation to convert one's competitive desire toward virtue into a desire simply to surpass others.[23] As we will see below, Plutarch envisions another innocuous form of emulation beyond self-rivalry; one makes moral progress through emulation of the divine.

These emotions are useful and motivating, but, as we have already seen, they are nonetheless capable of dangerous excess and inappropriate focus.[24] The desire for honor, for

---

[18] Quoting Theophrastus (fr. 467 Fortenbaugh), Plutarch writes that "the virtues…are confirmed by praises, and grow in the future, being kindled with pride" (αἱ ἀρεταὶ… ἐκβεβαιοῦνται τοῖς ἐπαίνοις, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν αὔξονται μετὰ φρονήματος ἐπαιρόμεναι).
[19] =[T85] in Chapter 5. See also §I.a–§I.c in Chapter 5.
[20] Cf. *On Moral Virtue* 452B4–6, which is discussed in Chapter 3, n. 60.
[21] See Plutarch, *Caesar* 58.4, which is discussed further in Chapter 3, n. 62.
[22] =[T56] in Chapter 3. I discuss these points and the examples in §V of Chapter 3 and §VI of Chapter 4.
[23] Cf. Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 2.1, quoted in n. 16 above. I discuss other perversions of the desire for honor below.
[24] In *Whether an Old Man Should Engage in Politics* 786C–D, 791C, 793D, and 794A, Plutarch criticizes excessive ambition in older individuals who engage in politics and argues that it is inappropriate in the old in *Lucullus* 38.3, *Marius* 2.4, 34.6, 45.10–12; *Marcellus* 28.6; *Flamininus* 20.1–2. Cf. also *On Moral Virtue* 447D2–E1, where Plutarch describes psychic conflict when a passion such as "ambition, love of strife, desire for favor, jealousy, or fear opposes reason" (πρὸς λογισμὸν …φιλοτιμίας ἢ φιλονεικίας ἢ χάριτος ἢ ζηλοτυπίας ἢ δέους ἀντιβαίνοντος). In each of these cases, the passion opposing rational calculation is in error and excessive. See §VI of Chapter 2 and §I of Chapter 4.

instance, can be twisted and give bloom to a bad and good-for-nothing passion such as envy (φθόνος, *On Listening to Lectures* 39D8–10),[25] since it results from an inappropriate desire for repute and unjust desire for honor (ἐκ φιλοδοξίας ἀκαίρου καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἀδίκου, *On Listening to Lectures* 39E8–11). The overly-quarrelsome disposition brought on by unhealthy competition can lead to unnecessary strife within the state, and rivalry that rouses an unhealthy love of strife belongs to vice (τὸ φιλόνεικον τῆς κακίας, *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 72D5–7). To keep this spirited passion from growing beyond its proper bounds and in the wrong direction, Plutarch recommends that we moderate this desire for honor (παραμυθώμεθα τὴν φιλοτιμίαν, *Precepts of Statecraft* 820A2–B1[26]; *Coriolanus* 1.5[27]). As Plutarch remarks regarding Alexander's great ambition, like Alcibiades' and Coriolanus', controlling these emotions is "the work of many bridling bits as well as rudders" (πολλῶν χαλινῶν ἔργον οἰάκων θ' ἅμα).[28] In Alexander's case, Philip sought Aristotle not only to steer Alexander's passions, but also to curb them from excess and to foster the right kind of growth for the development of good character (*Alexander* 17.1–2[29]).[30]

---

[25] "Envy combined with malignity and enmity" (φθόνος τοίνυν μετὰ βασκανίας καὶ δυσμενείας) "when it is present, is not a good thing for any deed, but rather is an impediment to everything noble" (οὐδενὶ μὲν ἔργῳ παρὼν ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐμπόδιος τοῖς καλοῖς). See §I of Chapter 4.

[26] Cf. *Precepts of Statecraft* 820A2–B1: We ought to assuage and moderate the love of honor (παραμυθώμεθα τὴν φιλοτιμίαν), teaching youths not to become swollen with ambition and pride due to praise.

[27] After discussing Coriolanus' oversized ambition and spirited emotions, Plutarch writes of spirited passions: "For nothing else do humans so enjoy from the favor of the Muses as to be made tame in their nature by reason and education, receiving moderation and casting off excess through reason" (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο Μουσῶν εὐμενείας ἀπολαύουσιν ἄνθρωποι τοσοῦτον, ὅσον ἐξημεροῦσθαι τὴν φύσιν ὑπὸ λόγου καὶ παιδείας, τῷ λόγῳ δεξαμένην τὸ μέτριον καὶ τὸ ἄγαν ἀποβαλοῦσαν). Cf. Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 443D7–10: The disposition produced in the non-rational part of the soul through habit is vice if the passion is poorly educated, but virtue if the passion is educated well by reason (ἂν καλῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου παιδαγωγηθῇ τὸ πάθος).

[28] Sophocles fr. 869 Radt in *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, quoted in Plutarch, *Alexander* 17.1–2. Cf. Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love* 767E6 for the same quotation. See the following note.

[29] Plutarch in *Alexander* 17.1–2 writes that Philip, recognizing that Alexander's nature was hard-to-subdue (καθορῶν δὲ τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ δυσνίκητον μὲν οὖσαν), realized that he was in need of a teacher who could use bridling bits as well as rudders and thus sent for the most renowned and learned of philosophers, Aristotle (μετεπέμψατο τῶν φιλοσόφων τὸν ἐνδοξότατον καὶ λογιώτατον Ἀριστοτέλην), to teach Alexander.

[30] On Plutarch's treatment of ambition as ambivalent, since it can be used to good ends or in excess to bad ends, see Duff 1999, pp. 83–7, and 2008, p. 14, who discusses many of the passages I mention above on the negative and positive aspects of ambition. On the ambiguity of the love of honor in Aristotle see *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.7,

The natural propensity to become virtuous, however, is not limited to individuals born with great natures or exceptional potential, such as Alcibiades, Coriolanus, or Alexander:

[T102] ἔνεστιν ἀμωσγέπως καὶ τοῖς ἀδοξοτέροις καὶ ταπεινοτέροις μοῖρά τις χάριτος ἢ δυνάμεως ἢ πρός τι καλὸν εὐφυΐας.

> There is inherent in some way or other, even in less reputable and more humble individuals, some share of grace, capacity, or natural goodness of growth for something noble. (Plutarch, *On Brotherly Love* 485A7–9)[31]

Even humble individuals are equipped from birth with natural desires for honor and the potential to become virtuous, since god grants to each soul from birth "the noble aspect of souls… naturally strong and not weakened in its own roots" (τὸ γενναῖον…ἰσχυρὸν αὐταῖς [ψυχαῖς] καὶ οὐκ ἐξίτηλον ἐμπέφυκεν, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 551D2–5). Plutarch further indicates that "[the young] have from nature a sense of shame as a noble starting-point for their salvation" (καλὴν ἀρχὴν πρὸς τὸ σωθῆναι τὸ αἰδεῖσθαι παρὰ τῆς φύσεως ἔχοντες, *On Listening to Lectures* 46E4–5). We all begin life with a passionate nature that is capable of developing and helping us to progress toward virtue, but, for Plutarch, nurture is more important than nature.[32]

§I.b. Cultivation of Virtue and Weeds of Vice Endemic to Human Nature

As we already saw in *On Compliancy* 529A10–C2 (=[T100]), promoting good growth sometimes involves more than pruning. One must cut out and uproot bad growth, pushing the spade in unsparingly (ἀφειδῶς ἐμβαλὼν τὸ σκαφεῖον ἀνέτρεψε τὴν ῥίζαν). This work of cultivation is not limited to souls full of exceptional potential or replete with a variety of strong passions, such as Alcibiades, Coriolanus, or Alexander (φύσει πολλῶν ὄντων καὶ μεγάλων

1107b21–1108a2, and 4.4, 1125b1–25. Cf. also Raymond 2017, who explores shame and honor in Aristotle and its relationship to Aristotle's conception of virtue.

[31] Cf. Albini 1997, p. 67.

[32] Cf. Xenophontos 2016, pp. 15 and 42.

παθῶν ἐν αὐτῷ, *Alcibiades* 2.1). In addition to having a natural disposition to grow toward virtue, Plutarch describes human nature itself as beset with weeds of vice *endemic* to its passionate nature. Evil desires, not just ambivalent passions, crop up on their own like indigenous weeds if the soul remains uncultivated and is left fallow (ὥσπερ ἐκ χώρας ἀκινήτου καὶ ἀργῆς ἄγρια πολλὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀναδιδούς, *On Listening to Lectures* 38C8–9):

[T103] τὰς γὰρ ἐφ' ἡδονὴν ὁρμὰς καὶ πρὸς πόνον ὑποψίας (οὐ θυραίους οὐδ' ὑπὸ λόγων ἐπεισάκτους, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ αὐτόχθονας οὔσας μυρίων παθῶν καὶ νοσημάτων πηγάς) ἂν ἐᾷ τις ἀφέτους ᾖ πεφύκασι χωρεῖν καὶ μὴ λόγοις χρηστοῖς ἀφαιρῶν ἢ παρατρέπων καταρτύῃ τὴν φύσιν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὃ τῶν θηρίων οὐκ ἂν ἡμερώτερον ἀνθρώπου φανείη.

> For impulses toward pleasure and suspicious aversion toward hard work (which are not impulses introduced from outside our nature nor brought in through the words of others, but are, as it were, sources springing from the ground itself, bringing forth a myriad of passions and diseases), if one allows these to go unhindered in their natural direction and does not tame one's own nature by removing them with useful words or turning them in a different direction, there is no beast that would appear wilder than man.[33]
>
> (Plutarch, *On Listening to Lectures* 38C10–D7)

Plutarch does not focus here, though he does elsewhere,[34] on especially perverse, lawless desires that are roused in dreams, such as the desire for sex with one's mother, which Socrates discusses in *Republic* 9 (572b3–c5).[35] Instead, Plutarch fixes our attention on *sources* (πηγαί) of desire that naturally crop up early in our lives and are ubiquitous and indigenous (αὐτόχθονες) to human nature.[36] Even natures that seem best poised for excellence are beset by, as it were, internal weeds with the potential to lead to vice (*Can Virtue be Taught* 439B4–7).[37]

---

[33] Cf. Plato, *Laws* 6, 766a1–4; 7, 808d1–7.
[34] *On Virtue and Vice* 100F10–101A7; *On Moral Progress* 83A4–B8=[T64] in Chapter 4.
[35] Socrates likewise claims that these evil desires are ubiquitous (572b3–6), though he does qualify that there *may* be a few individuals who remove these errant passions, *or* it may just be that they are very weak in these more moderate individuals (571b5–c1). Those cases appear to be rare. Whether or not Socrates considers these bad passions eliminable, he believes that we all begin life with impulses toward vice.
[36] Cf. Plutarch's quotation of Democritus in *Whether the Affections of the Soul are Worse Than Those of the Body* 500D5–E3=68 B 149 DK.
[37] "Even if nature spontaneously produces something noble, this becomes obscured by a great portion of what is foreign to itself, just like a fruitful crop mixed with useless, impure material" (εἰ καί τι καλὸν ἡ φύσις αὐτομάτως

Errant desires and evil passions have a deep root that seems relatively innocuous at first glance. Yet, if left untended and untrained (ἀπαίδευτοι), these natural inclinations, namely, the impulses (ὁρμαί) and desires (ἐπιθυμίαι) toward pleasure and aversion to hard work, tend to master the souls of the young and are hard to remove later in life; they become part of their nature later (*On Listening to Lectures* 37C4–D4).[38] They have a *pull*, moreover, that draws one along a natural pathway (ᾗ πεφύκασι χωρεῖν) to develop habits in the direction of vice.[39]

Plutarch's view on the inherent sources of corruption stands in contrast with his Stoic opponents, who believe that we have *undeviating* starting-points toward virtue (ἀφορμὰς ἀδιαστρόφους).[40] It does, however, fit well with the overall picture we have seen Plutarch

---

ἐκφέρει, τοῦτο πολλῷ τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ, καθάπερ ὕλῃ καρπὸς ἀγρίᾳ καὶ ἀκαθάρτῳ μ(ε)ιγνύμενος, ἐξαμαυροῦται).

[38] "For, lack of control, which some young men consider to be freedom because of their lack of education, establishes the desires that have been, as it were, let loose from their restraints, as harsher masters than childhood teachers and tutors" (ἀναρχία μὲν γάρ, ἣν ἔνιοι τῶν νέων ἐλευθερίαν ἀπαιδευσίᾳ νομίζουσι, χαλεπωτέρους ἐκείνων τῶν ἐν παισὶ διδασκάλων καὶ παιδαγωγῶν δεσπότας ἐφίστησι τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ὥσπερ ἐκ δεσμῶν λυθείσας). Cf. Pseudo-Plutarch, *On the Education of Children* 2D1–10: "By hard work, what is contrary to nature comes to be greater than what was according to nature" (τὸ παρὰ φύσιν τῷ πόνῳ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγένετο κρεῖττον). Although it is unlikely that Plutarch wrote *On the Education of Children* (for which, see Wyttenbach 6.1, pp. 29–64 and Sirinelli 1987, pp. 25–26), this work nevertheless represents the kinds of arguments and metaphors in vogue in Plutarch's time and also has strong parallels with Plutarch's own sentiments and language.

[39] In *Whether "Live Unknown" is a Wise Precept* 1129D3–11, Plutarch describes the natural putrefaction and decay that occurs in souls due to inaction and lack of cultivation: The character of a man attracts mold (εὐρώς) or slough (γῆρας), as it were, through inaction (ἐν ἀπραξίᾳ). It withers (μαραίνει) and rots (σήπεται) like a stagnant pool. One's natural powers become corrupted and fail (φθείρονται καὶ ἀπογηράσκουσιν αἱ σύμφυτοι δυνάμεις).

[40] For the Stoics, nature provides *undeviating starting-points* that lead to virtues (ἡ φύσις ἀφορμὰς δίδωσιν ἀδιαστρόφους), though the rational mind can be perverted sometimes because of the persuasiveness of external matters and sometimes due to discourse with companions (διαστρέφεσθαι δὲ τὸ λογικὸν ζῷον, ποτὲ μὲν διὰ τὰς τῶν ἔξωθεν πραγματειῶν πιθανότητας, ποτὲ δὲ διὰ τὴν κατήχησιν τῶν συνόντων, D.L. 7.89=*SVF* 3.228). Corruption comes from *outside* (ἔξωθεν) ourselves. On the persuasiveness of external matters, Calcidius, *Commentary on the Timaeus* 165=*SVF* 3.229, understands this to indicate early experiences of pleasure and pain, such as the emergence of a newborn to painful cold air and the assuagement of discomfort within a warm bath prepared by a doctor. These experiences lead to false notions of good and bad and are learned through experience and are still due to external influence. Galen, *On Hippocrates' and Plato's Doctrines* 5.5.2–3=SVF 3.229a, argues that the Stoics ought to admit that the persuasiveness of pleasurable and painful experiences reveals *something within* our nature itself that is attracted to the former and averse to the latter, which would mean that there are natural tendencies for deviation from virtue within our nature. Cf. Long 1968b, pp. 336–7: "The Stoics would presumably answer that Galen is confusing sensation with judgment. The young child takes physical well-being as his criterion because he has nothing else to take. If in maturity we make sources of pleasure and pain morally significant we are continuing to take sensation as our criterion and employing *logos* not for its own sake but purely as the servant of physical well-being. The fact that this is not the role of *logos* is proved by reference to animals and young children who are able to further these ends perfectly well without it." Cf. Nussbaum 1994, pp. 389–90, n. 68.

painting on the need for the *cultivation* (ἐργάσιμον) of our nature through *hard work* (ἔργον and πόνος).[41] A natural distaste for hard work and an attraction to easy pleasure leads one *away* from the arduous steps required to become good.[42] Hard work is, for Plutarch, one of two essential ingredients for moral progress, as he writes in his biographical work on Demosthenes:

[T104] εἰκός ἐστι…τὴν δ' ἀρετὴν ὥσπερ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ διαρκὲς φυτὸν ἐν ἅπαντι ῥιζοῦσθαι τόπῳ, φύσεώς γε χρηστῆς καὶ φιλοπόνου ψυχῆς ἐπιλαμβανομένην.

> It is likely that…virtue, like a strong and robust plant, takes root in any place if it takes hold of a nature that is good and a soul that is willing to do hard work.
> (Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 1.3–4)

Again, not only is a good *nature* (φύσις) required, of the sort we saw described as fertile for good development (εὐφυΐα), but a soul in which virtue is to flourish must not be completely averse to hard work, but rather keenly adapted to it (φιλόπονος).

The goodness of soul required for virtue is not a final product but goodness *in potential* for development, since even partially corrupted passions, like weeds taking root in one's soul, can be a sign of a nature that is fertile for growth in virtue:

[T105] ἔνια τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς φυομένων αὐτὰ μέν ἐστιν ἄγρια τῇ φύσει καὶ ἄκαρπα καὶ βλαβερὰν τοῖς ἡμέροις σπέρμασι καὶ φυτοῖς τὴν αὔξησιν ἔχοντα, σημεῖα δ' αὐτὰ ποιοῦνται χώρας οἱ γεωργοῦντες οὐ πονηρᾶς ἀλλὰ γενναίας καὶ πίονος· οὕτω δὴ καὶ πάθη ψυχῆς ἔστιν οὐ χρηστά, χρηστῆς δὲ φύσεως οἷον ἐξανθήματα καὶ λόγῳ παρασχεῖν ἐργάσιμον ἑαυτὴν ἐπιεικῶς δυναμένης.

> Some plants that grow from the earth are themselves wild in nature and not fruitful and have growth that is harmful to cultivated seeds and plants, but farmers consider these wild plants to be signs of soil that is not worthless but excellent and rich. In this way, there are also passions of the soul that are not good, but are like the outgrowths of a good nature that is also able to provide itself suitably to reason for cultivation.

---

[41] Cf. the Epicurean notion of moral responsibility, given different seeds that tend to grow in different directions (Epicurus, *On Nature* 34.26–30=LS 20C). We are morally responsible, Epicurus argues, otherwise there would be no purpose to rebuking (νουθετεῖν), opposing (μάχεσθαι), and changing (μεταρυθμίζειν) one another. Cf. Németh 2017, pp. 90–2.

[42] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 2, 364c6–d2, wherein Hesiod, *Works and Days* 287–9 is quoted: "Wickedness, in fact, in great abundance is easy / to choose. The path is smooth and it very much dwells close by, / while the gods have placed sweat as a preliminary to virtue" (τὴν μὲν κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἑλέσθαι / ῥηϊδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναίει· / τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἱδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκαν).

(Plutarch, *On Compliancy* 528C1–D5)[43]

In the last line of this passage, Plutarch writes that a good soul provides itself to *reason* (λόγῳ) for cultivation, i.e. the hard work that produces a virtuous disposition occurs through the use of reason. It is not merely by blind chance that virtue is developed; it must be overseen and guided with foresight and wisdom. This role, in following with Plutarch's plant metaphors, belongs to the caretaker / farmer of the soul (κηδεμών / γεωργός).[44]

Yet sometimes the farmer cannot remove the weeds without damaging the good growth, no matter how skillful he may be. In *How to Profit by One's Enemies*, Plutarch suggests *diverting* negative passions away from one's friends toward one's enemies,[45] but only if there is no way to rid oneself of these passions:

[T106] οὐκοῦν καὶ ἡμῶν καταναλισκόμενα ταῦτα τὰ πάθη πρὸς τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἧττον ἐνοχλήσει τοῖς φίλοις…ἀλλ' εἰ μηδεὶς τρόπος ἐστὶν ἄλλος ἀπαλλαγῆς ἐρίδων καὶ φθόνων καὶ φιλονεικιῶν, ἔθιζε σεαυτὸν δάκνεσθαι τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐημερούντων, καὶ παρόξυνε καὶ χάραττε τὸ φιλόνεικον ἐν ἐκείνοις θηγόμενον. ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ χαρίεντες γεωργοὶ τὰ ῥόδα καὶ τὰ ἴα βελτίω ποιεῖν νομίζουσι σκόροδα καὶ κρόμμυα παραφυτεύοντες (ἀποκρίνεται γὰρ εἰς ἐκεῖνα πᾶν ὅσον ἔνεστι τῇ τροφῇ δριμὺ καὶ δυσῶδες), οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἀναλαμβάνων καὶ περισπῶν τὸ κακόηθες καὶ βάσκανον, εὐμενέστερον παρέξει σε τοῖς φίλοις εὖ πράττουσι καὶ ἀλυπότερον.

Therefore, even these passions when used up on our enemies will be less distressful against our friends…but if there is no other way to escape strife, envy, and quarrels, habituate yourself to feel a sting when your enemies prosper and sharpen and whet your quarrelsomeness, brought to a jagged point among them [your enemies]. For just as clever farmers think that by planting garlic and onions next to roses and violets they make their flowers better (since whatever sharpness and foul-smells are present in their food, as a whole it is separated off into those others [the garlic and onions]), likewise

[43] Cf. Plutarch, *Dion* 4.1–2; *On Nature and Hard Work*=Sandbach fr. 172=Photius, *Library* 161. Cf. also *On Envy and Hate* 537E8–10: "These passions are nurtured and made to grow…just like plants" (τὰ πάθη ταῦτα…ὥσπερ τὰ φυτὰ καὶ τρέφεσθαι καὶ αὔξεσθαι). The author of *On the Education of Children* similarly writes that a piece of soil is good, but its goodness will be lost if not tended to, since it requires work for it to be productive and reach its potential (2E1–12).

[44] Cf. Plutarch, *Lycurgus and Numa* 4.4–5, quoted in n. 8 above. Cf. also *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 552C3–D3: Just as a good farmer will see the potential in a field that is overgrown with thorns and will wisely wait for the right moment when it is ripe and ready to produce its own fruit (ἡλικίαν καὶ ὥραν, ᾗ τὸν οἰκεῖον ἡ φύσις καρπὸν ἀποδίδωσι), likewise the wise teacher is patient with his students.

[45] This appears to be what Plutarch has in mind for passions that one cannot remove and must divert (παρατρέπων) in *On Listening to Lectures* 38C10–D7=[T82]).

> even an enemy, receiving and drawing off our nastiness and pettiness, will present you as more amiable and less grievous toward your friends when they are prospering.
> (Plutarch, *How to Profit by One's Enemies* 92A3–B10).

These negative emotions are not merely weaponized against one's enemies, but focused so that they do not risk causing collateral damage to our friends.

This is not, however, Plutarch's only suggestion for how we can handle our natural inclinations toward meanness and vice. It is a further measure we can take if there is no other means of escaping these passions (εἰ μηδεὶς τρόπος ἐστὶν ἄλλος ἀπαλλαγῆς). The better option, which Plutarch often recommends, is to cultivate the opposite passions of kindness (φιλανθρωπία), benevolence (εὔνοια), and gentleness (πραότης),[46] not only toward friends, but also toward non-rational animals, since even our treatment of these creatures affects how our character develops (*On the Eating of Flesh* 1, 996A6–9).[47] Pythagoras, Plutarch writes, tried to keep people from mistreating animals because he understood this principle of human character, namely, that how we treat animals affects how we are disposed to treat other humans (*How to Profit by One's Enemies* 91B13–D6). It is, moreover, characteristic of a good person to be kind and gentle toward others when no obligation is present, even to old animals that are no longer serviceable and useful to oneself (*Marcus Cato* 5.2).[48]

---

[46] See n. 128 below.

[47] "Does this not seem to you a marvelous habituation for kindness toward other humans? For who could wrong another human being if he is so gently and kindly disposed toward creatures that are foreign to his own nature and not his kindred?" (ὁ πρὸς φιλανθρωπίαν ἐθισμὸς οὐ δοκεῖ θαυμαστὸν εἶναι; τίς γὰρ ἂν ἀδικήσειεν ἄνθρωπον οὕτω πρὸς ἀλλότρια καὶ ἀσύμφυλα διακείμενος πράως καὶ φιλανθρώπως;)

[48] "And yet we see that kindness extends more widely than justice, since we use law and what is just naturally only in our treatment of humans, but from gentleness of character flows, as though from an abundant spring, acts of beneficence and graciousness sometimes even toward non-rational animals. For indeed, the nourishing of horses that have been worn down by time and the care of aged dogs, not just young pups, befits a man who is good in character" (καίτοι τὴν χρηστότητα τῆς δικαιοσύνης πλατύτερον τόπον ὁρῶμεν ἐπιλαμβάνουσαν· νόμῳ μὲν γὰρ καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους μόνον χρῆσθαι πεφύκαμεν, πρὸς εὐεργεσίας δὲ καὶ χάριτας ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ μέχρι τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων ὥσπερ ἐκ πηγῆς πλουσίας ἀπορρεῖ τῆς ἡμερότητος. καὶ γὰρ ἵππων ἀπειρηκότων ὑπὸ χρόνου τροφαὶ καὶ κυνῶν οὐ σκυλακεῖαι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ γηροκομίαι τῷ χρηστῷ προσήκουσιν). On this last passage see Sorabji 1993, p. 118.

§I.c. The Growth within the Passions and the Fruit of Virtue

Let us take stock of the positive features we already find emerging from Plutarch's metaphor of cultivating plants. Through this metaphor, we find that *passions* are the plants that grow and must be cultivated for virtue (*On Moral Virtue* 443C10–D1,[49] 443D7–10[50], 451C2–5[51]; *On Love*=Sandbach frr. 134 and 136[52]). The implication of *On Compliancy* 528C1–D5 and 529A10–C2 (=[T105] and [T100])[53] is not only that the fertile soil that can grow to vice is often equally fertile for development in virtue, but also that virtue *requires* the growth of certain passions. Just as the farmer seeks the growth of fruitful crops, the cultivator of the soul seeks the growth and development of fruitful passions.

Passions are necessary also because they provide *growth* toward virtue. The task of reason and the rational agent who cultivates passions is to protect and promote virtuous development from the passions and impulses inherent within the soul (Plutarch, *Whether "Live Unknown" is a Wise Precept* 1129D3–11)[54] so that they grow toward virtue (φύεσθαι πρὸς ἀρετήν). But, just as a farmer nourishes plants to promote the growth that unfolds from roots of

[49] =[T36] in Chapter 2 (see also §V in Chapter 2): Reason produces ethical virtues *within* the passions.
[50] See n. 27 above. Cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 245c–e: Plutarch seems to be drawing on the psychic self-movement possible in plants, which the rational part of the soul harnesses and guides. Yet, it also has some sense of self-direction, which I discuss below.
[51] "A human being has participation in the non-rational and has the source of passion as something natural, not as added [from outside], but as necessary, which should not be removed entirely but which needs cultivation and education" (μέτεστιν οὖν αὐτῷ [τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, B11] καὶ τοῦ ἀλόγου, καὶ σύμφυτον ἔχει τὴν τοῦ πάθους ἀρχήν, οὐκ ἐπεισόδιον ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίαν οὖσαν, οὐδ' ἀναιρετέαν παντάπασιν ἀλλὰ θεραπείας καὶ παιδαγωγίας δεομένην).
[52] For these passages see n. 12 above.
[53] Cf. Plutarch, *How to Profit by One's Enemies* 92A3–B10=[T87].
[54] See n. 39 above. The good growth needs to be activated and encouraged, since bad growth thrives on lack of cultivation and stagnation. Nevertheless, it is the natural powers within the soul (αἱ σύμφυτοι δυνάμεις), as in a plant, that are promoted.

the plant (Sandbach fr. 104[55]; *On Envy and Hate* 537E8–10[56]), the ability to grow toward virtue (πρὸς ἀρετὴν εὐφυΐα, *Alcibiades* 4.1) lies within the passions and springs from our passionate nature itself. It is not added from outside.

Passions additionally provide not only the impetus to grow, but also produce the *fruit* (καρπός) of virtue when brought to their proper ends. Just as the soul has certain impulses and desires that naturally lead to vice, like weeds within the soul, the end-goal of certain passions is to produce the *fruit* of character suited to friendship and virtue (καρπὸν ἤθους οἰκεῖον εἰς φιλίαν καὶ ἀρετὴν…ἀποδίδωσιν, *Dialogue on Love* 750E2–6).[57] Virtues begin to grow and sprout in our youth (φυόμεναι καὶ βλαστάνουσαι, *Agis and Cleomenes* 2.2), and this growth must be guided by a farmer of sorts so that it is not choked out, does not overgrow its bounds, and is not corrupted from external forces. Nevertheless, contained within the nature of the passions, like plants, is the power to produce the fruit of virtue.

Through the metaphor of cultivation analyzed thus far, Plutarch brings out several points that we have seen expressed through other metaphors in his works. In the Wind in Our Sails passage, the rational part of the soul needs the passions to get the ship of soul moving (*On Moral*

---

[55] =Scholia to Hesiod, *Works and Days*. Plutarch writes, "The description of 'nourishing from within' is appropriate for planting, since [Hesiod] indicates through the description that it calls forth the principle from within the root and causes it to advance and grow" (τὸ "ἐνθρέψασθαι" οἰκείως ἔχει πρὸς τὴν φυτείαν· τὸ γὰρ προκαλέσασθαι τὸν ῥιζικὸν λόγον καὶ εἰς ἐπίδοσιν ἄγειν καὶ βλάστην ἐσήμηνε διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος).

[56] See n. 43 above. Cf. Aristotle, *On the Generation of Animals* 2.1, 735a15–17: "What has the principle of growth comes first by necessity, since this nutritive element belongs to all alike, whether plant or animal" (τοῦτο δὲ γίγνεσθαι ἀνάγκη πρῶτον ὃ αὐξήσεως ἀρχὴν ἔχει· εἴτε γὰρ φυτὸν εἴτε ζῷον ὁμοίως τοῦτο πᾶσιν ὑπάρχει τὸ θρεπτικόν); *ibid*. 2.4, 739b34–740a1; *On the Soul* 3.12, 434a22–434b18; *On the Parts of Animals* 4.10, 687a24–690a10; *Metaphysics* Λ 10, 1075a16–25.

[57] Personified Love (ἔρως) has no desire to continue to cultivate a plant that is ripe and in season (οὐκ ἐθέλει παραμένειν οὐδὲ θεραπεύειν ἐφ' ὥρᾳ τὸ…ἀκμάζον) if it does not produce the fruit of character aimed at friendship and virtue (εἰ καρπὸν ἤθους οἰκεῖον εἰς φιλίαν καὶ ἀρετὴν οὐκ ἀποδίδωσιν). Cf. Badnall 2009, who argues that the *fruit* of virtue and friendship between men in Plutarch's *Dialogue on Love* is contrasted with the mere flowery blossoms that come from marriage between man and wife, an ironic twist on biological procreation. Cf. also Brenk 1988, who defends Plutarch's praise of marriage as part of one's ascent to union with god. *Contra* Badnall, I, along with Brenk, find that Plutarch's positive evaluation of marriage includes deep intimacy and friendship productive of virtue. See also n. 75 below and n. 79 in Chapter 3.

Virtue 452B1–4).[58] We need passions for action, including virtuous action. Likewise, in the Myth of the Charioteer drawn from Plato's *Phaedrus*, the passions provide drive and motion that is to be harnessed and used for good.[59] Through the image of virtue as a harmony between the rational and non-rational parts of the soul, reason requires the passions in order to produce virtue *within* them (*On Moral Virtue* 444C6–9).[60] Finally, though this list is by no means exhaustive, Plutarch's use of the medical analogy also intimates that passions need to be in a healthy condition, moderate and not excessive.[61]

In the metaphor of plant cultivation, we find that Plutarch stresses positive contributions beyond their necessity as an ingredient for virtue. Passions provide for growth and development toward virtue, all the way up to the culmination of moral virtue, which is the blossoming and fruitful outcome of well-developed passions moderated and guided by reason. Passions, from this perspective, are not necessary evils of embodiment. They are *good* for moral progress and *part* of the good, morally virtuous life itself. They *contribute* to moral virtue. As we move to Plutarch's description of the seeds of virtue and justice in the next section, and then to Plutarch's view of the ideal, morally virtuous life in the final section, we will continue to see that passions are an integral part of the moral life for Plutarch from life's inception to the end-goal (τέλος) of becoming like god (ὁμοιώσις τῷ θεῷ).

---

[58] =[T52] in Chapter 3. See also §II in Chapter 3.
[59] Cf. Plutarch, *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008A1–5, C5–D6; 1009B2–8. See also §II in Chapter 3.
[60] =[T35] in Chapter 2. See §V in Chapter 2.
[61] On Plutarch's description of excessive passions as diseases see §VI in Chapter 2, §IV and n. 38 in Chapter 5. On the medical analogy applied to excessive passions or toward passions viewed as diseases from Plato's works, among different Hellenistic schools, and through to Neoplatonic writers see Annas 1992, pp. 19–36; Nussbaum 1994, *passim*; Becchi 1999; Sorabji 2000, pp. 17–28; White 2008, pp. 292–6, esp. nn. 50–2; Malherbe 2014, esp. pp. 123–34 and n. 13. While Nussbaum provides an excellent analysis of therapeutic methods aimed at curing passions, she is surprisingly silent on the metaphor of cultivating passions, barring a few dead metaphors that describe the need to "cultivate" certain virtues in Aristotle's view of moral excellence (pp. 78 and 94, in the chapter *Aristotle on Emotions and Ethical Health*, pp. 78–101).

§II The Seeds of Virtue: The Background

As we will see in the next section, Plutarch goes against the grain in his use of the cultivation metaphor. Before we turn to Plutarch's view, we will look briefly at the background to which he responds. In several of Plutarch's predecessors, including Plato, the seeds of virtue are rational in nature; they are not part of our passionate nature, even if they are, as it were, sown into it.

Plato's *Phaedrus* makes use of the metaphor of cultivation but describes the seeds that are fruitful for virtue not as passions, but as forms of discourse. The educator in the *Phaedrus* skillfully and seriously considers how he will plant the seeds of *discourse* and *instruction* (λόγοι), like a skilled and earnest farmer, taking into account the right soil, i.e. the soul of his student, and the critical moment to plant the seed, i.e. the right time to provide instruction.[62] Once the seeds take root and come to fruition, they propagate themselves through new discourse, planting more seeds in other souls, continuing the process without end (276b1–277a4).[63]

Plato's *Symposium* and *Theaetetus* employ the metaphor of pregnancy to a similar end, albeit with the notion of human seed. As in the metaphor of cultivation in the *Phaedrus*, the seeds of discourse that impregnate a soul have a natural impulse toward growth, development, and self-perpetuation. One who is pregnant also begins a process that impregnates others with the seeds of discourse and argument and propagates virtue through the spread of ideas and arguments (*Symposium* 208e1–209e4).[64] In the *Theaetetus*, Socrates watches over the offspring

[62] Cf. Plutarch, Sandbach fr. 104=Scholia to Hesiod, *Works and Days*.
[63] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 10.9, 1179b23–6=[T89] in Chapter 5: The seeds of virtue are discussion and teaching (ὁ λόγος καὶ ἡ διδαχή). They are sown, as it were, into the passionate nature which is likened to soil that provides nourishment to the seed (ὥσπερ γῆν τὴν θρέψουσαν τὸ σπέρμα).
[64] In the *Symposium*, one who is pregnant in soul with wisdom and the rest of virtue (φρόνησίς τε καὶ ἡ ἄλλη ἀρετή, 209a3–4), especially with moderation and justice (σωφροσύνη τε καὶ δικαιοσύνη, 209a8), abounds immediately in discourse about virtue and about what kind of character a good man should have and what he should do (εὐθὺς εὐπορεῖ λόγων περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ περὶ οἷον χρὴ εἶναι τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἃ ἐπιτηδεύειν,

that one produces to aid in one's progress (150b6–151a5). The pregnancy, moreover, is one that gives birth to either falsehood or a fertile truth (ψεῦδος ἀποτίκτε…ἢ γόνιμόν τε καὶ ἀληθές, 150c2–3).[65] In both the *Symposium* and *Theaetetus*, as in the *Phaedrus*, discourse and argument serve as seeds that are implanted later to blossom and produce an upright, virtuous character of soul. Moral development seems primarily concerned with the rational aspect of the soul and becoming well informed with the right kinds of beliefs.

Philo of Alexandria and the author of *On the Education of Children*, which is spuriously attributed to Plutarch,[66] follow suit and identify the seeds of virtue with rational discourse aimed at the education of the rational part of the soul. Philo, for example, dedicates several chapters of *On Agriculture* (9–18) to an allegorical interpretation of Noah's role as a gardener of souls, describing the seeds of virtues as rational in nature, closely connecting them with education in reading, writing, the interpretation of poetry, geometry, and music in general, which one plants within young souls (φυτεύειν δὲ ταῖς μὲν ἐν ἡλικίᾳ παιδικῇ ψυχαῖς, 18).[67] In *On the Education of Children*, the seed that develops into the crop of virtue is explicitly likened to counsels in speech and instruction (ἔοικεν…σπέρματι δ᾽ αἱ τῶν λόγων ὑποθῆκαι καὶ τὰ παραγγέλματα), planted in the soul by the farmer, i.e. the teacher (2B5–C1).[68]

209b8–c1) and he tries to educate the one whom he attempts to impregnate (καὶ ἐπιχειρεῖ παιδεύειν, 209c2–3). Educated through such discourse, the second person conceives and also gives birth (209c2–4).

[65] Shortly before discussing psychic pregnancy, Socrates draws upon the cultivation metaphor to ask whether the art of sowing is the same as that of tending to the crops and harvesting them (149e1–4). See n. 13 above for the quotation. For further discussion of the cultivation metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus* and its connection to the pregnancy metaphor of the *Symposium* and *Theaetetus* see Cotton 2010.

[66] See n. 38 above.

[67] Cf. Philo, *On the Life of Abraham* 220–3: Passions grow and choke out what is healthy in the soul, namely, "the teachings that lead to virtue and the study of wisdom itself" (τὰ καθ᾽ ἑκάστην ἀρετὴν δόγματα καὶ τὰ σοφίας αὐτῆς θεωρήματα, 220). In *On the Descendants of Cain* 135.4–6, Philo discusses "seeds of thought" (τὰ φρονήσεως σπέρματα). Cf. also Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* 3.250 where the seeds of virtue are contrasted with thorny stuff. Cf. also *ibid*. 3.187 and *On the Life of Abraham* 220–3. Cf. also Horowitz 1998, pp. 62–4, who connects Philo's allegory of the garden of the soul with Stoic influence.

[68] "Just as in the case of farming, first, the soil needs to be good, then the cultivator must be knowledgeable, and finally the seeds must be excellent. In the same way, nature is like the soul, the educator like the farmer, and counsels in speech and instructions are like the seed" (ὥσπερ δ᾽ ἐπὶ τῆς γεωργίας πρῶτον μὲν ἀγαθὴν ὑπάρξαι

The notion, and phrase "seeds of virtue" (*semina virtutis*), is especially prominent in Latin Stoic sources and describes the initial development of the rational aspects of human nature.[69] The seeds of virtue are generally synonymous with the seeds of knowledge (*semina scientiae*) in these sources, connected to the early Stoic notion of the "seminal reason" (λόγος σπερματικός) that guides progress throughout nature.[70] Yet even among the Stoics, who teach that we do not have inherent inclinations toward vice, the formation of virtue still requires training and cultivation of these seeds.[71] The direction our life will take is not fully determined by innate inclination, since we are morally responsible for our actions; we can assent to or dissent from impulses that prompt us.[72] Additionally, if our nature is neglected, we can fall prey to external corruption and fail to develop our rational nature to its full potential.[73]

Nevertheless, in each of these cases, the seeds of virtue are rational in nature. Within the human soul, virtues are rooted primarily in seeds implanted by instruction and discourse. Passions may be the soil in which they grow or even hindrances that interfere with their implantation and growth, but they are not the starting-points for growth in virtue.[74]

δεῖ τὴν γῆν, εἶτα δὲ τὸν φυτουργὸν ἐπιστήμονα, εἶτα τὰ σπέρματα σπουδαῖα, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον γῇ μὲν ἔοικεν ἡ φύσις, γεωργῷ δ᾽ ὁ παιδεύων, σπέρματι δ᾽ αἱ τῶν λόγων ὑποθῆκαι καὶ τὰ παραγγέλματα). Cf. the Parable of the Sower in the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew 13.1–9 and 18–23; Mark 4.1–9 and 13–20; Luke 8.4–8 and 11–15), where the seed sown is the word of God (ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, Luke 8.11, cf. Matthew 13.18–23; Mark 4.14).

[69] See esp. Cicero, *On the Republic* 1.41, *On Ends* 5.17–20 (=LS 64G), 5.58–9; Seneca, *Letters* 65.4, 65.12, 90.29, 90.46; 124.10–11.

[70] See Seneca, *Letters* 49.12 and 120.4. Cf. Horowitz 1998, pp. 26–34, esp. 27–30.

[71] *SVF* 3.225.

[72] *SVF* 2.91, 2.980, 3.171, 3.307; D.L. 7.86. Cf. Long 1968b, pp. 336–9.

[73] *SVF* 3.537; 3.214 and 216. Cf. Long 1971a, p. 184 and nn. 36–9.

[74] Cf. Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods* 2.58=LS53Y=*SVF* 1.172, where the Stoic speaker, Balbus, refers to seeds that provide impulse (ὁρμαί) in the world, which are likened to passions in the human soul, but the connection is not made firm or clear in this passage.

The exception may lie, curiously, in the Epicurean notion of seeds, but the notion of cultivating character is less developed here than one would like. According to Epicurus, we all begin with seeds of varied kinds that lead us in this direction or that, including toward certain actions (πράξεις), thoughts (διανοήσεις), and dispositions (διαθέσεις) of character. We are responsible for how we develop our character given these different sources of motion within our nature (Epicurus, *On Nature* 34.26–30=LS 20C), which Epicurus offers as proof that we have free will. Cf. Németh 2017, pp. 90–2. Horowitz 1998 completely neglects the Epicurean notion of seeds in her book on

§III Affection and the Seeds of Virtue in Plutarch

Given this background, it is perhaps surprising that Plutarch does not describe the seeds of virtue as rational in nature, especially vis-à-vis Plato's *Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, and *Theaetetus*. In line with the positive implications of Plutarch's metaphor of cultivating passions, the seeds for Plutarch, like the plants that blossom into virtue, stem from our *passionate* nature in desires and impulses.[75] Plutarch calls the natural goodness (εὐφυΐα) aimed at what is honorable and wont to avoid what is shameful the seed (σπέρμα), as it were, and the starting-point (ἀρχή) to progress (προκοπή) in virtue (*Table-Talk* 636B2–6).[76] Plutarch also identifies the spirited passions associated with his concept of εὐφυΐα as the elements that set one's first footstep on the path to virtue (εἰς ἴχνος τι πρῶτον ἀρετῆς καθιστάντες, *Can Virtue be Taught* 439F2–5).[77] Passions not only provide growth, as though adding nourishment or increase from without, but passions also contain the initial impetus for growth and development in virtue within their very nature, as the seeds that are the starting-points for virtue.

Just as a seed contains natural powers within itself (αἱ ἐν αὐτῷ φυσικαὶ δυνάμεις) for growth and is determinative of the initial direction of this growth (Plutarch, Sandbach fr. 104),[78]

---

the seeds of virtue and knowledge. Cf. also Lucretius, *On the Nature of Things* 1.159–73=LS 4B; 2.251–93=LS 20F; 5.837–77=LS 13I. Cf. also Aristotle, *History of Animals* 8.1, 588a31–b3.

[75] While Plutarch identifies the seeds of character development, particularly moral virtue, as sprouting from our passionate nature, he does sometimes use the imagery of seeds for teaching that shapes belief. See *Advice to Bride and Groom* 145D9–E3, where Plutarch advises husbands to guard against the seeds of bad beliefs that can crop up in the minds of their brides. They ought to sow the seeds of good teachings and arguments (λόγων χρηστῶν σπέρματα), since, Plutarch writes, their brides do not receive the same education (παιδεία) as their husbands. Cf. Horowitz 1998, p. 31, n. 65. Cf. also Badnall 2009, who argues that the friendship between husband and wife is represented as producing flowers, while that between men can produce the fruit of virtue. *Contra* Badnall, see Brenk 1988, Crawford 1999, and n. 79 in Chapter 3.

[76] See n. 3 above.

[77] =[T86] in Chapter 5.

[78] =Scholia to Hesiod, *Works and Days*: The seed needs external pressure, "pressing into the natural powers within the seed and causing them to flow out" (πιεζόντων ἔσω καὶ χεόντων τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ φυσικὰς δυνάμεις). Cf. Philo, *On the Life of Moses* 2.181–2: The seed of virtue "grows from no other power but from itself" (οὐκ ἐξ ἑτέρας δυνάμεως ἀλλ' ἐξ ἑαυτῆς φύεται); *On Rewards and Punishments* 172. Cf. also Aristotle, *Great Ethics* 1.10.1.2–1.10.2.1: Every nature is generative of what is like itself (πᾶσα γὰρ φύσις γεννητική ἐστιν οὐσίας τοιαύτης οἵα ἐστίν), both plants and animals (τὰ φυτὰ καὶ τὰ ζῷα), since both are generative from their starting-points

certain passions have natural pathways that draw us in the right direction of virtue (*On Moral Virtue* 452D3–8).[79] Not only do they have virtue as their fruit (καρπός), but they can produce powerful affective desires for virtue (δεινοὶ ἔρωτες πρὸς τὴν ἀρετήν, *On Listening to Lectures* 47C5–6), so that one is "driven like a non-rational animal with a longing for philosophy" (ὥσπερ ἄλογος ἐλαύνεται πόθῳ τῷ πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν, *On Moral Progress* 76F7–77C6),[80] causing an experience like hunger and thirst for moral progress (πείνῃ τινὶ καὶ δίψῃ πάθος ὅμοιον, 77C8–10).[81] They engender strong passions that draw us ever more to progress in virtue.

In addition to passions associated with honor and shame, Plutarch lays particular emphasis on the passion of affection (φιλοστοργία) as the seed that leads to the virtue of justice and is at the heart of human social life. As we will explore in this section, we all are born with a natural tendency toward affiliation with others rooted in affection. This non-rational passion is insufficient to take us to a fully virtuous life without rational instruction and guidance; justice requires the presence of practical wisdom (ἡ δικαιοσύνη τῆς φρονήσεως δεῖται παρούσης, *On Chance* 97E9–10). Nor will it provide a conception of the good.[82] Nevertheless, it is a starting-point (ἀρχή) and sign of our natural orientation to the social virtue of justice (*On the*

(γεννητικὰ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχῶν) and what follows from them is like them (ὡς γὰρ ἂν ἔχωσιν αἱ ἀρχαί, οὕτως καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχῶν ἔχει). On questions of authorship of the *Great Ethics* see Rowe 1975; Kenny 1978. pp. 215–39; and Cooper 1999d and n. 45 in Chapter 1. Cf. also Aristotle, *On the Generation of Animals* 2, 739b34–740a1: "For the first principle is present in the seeds within them [humans, whose seeds act like seeds sown in soil], and, whenever it, though being present potentially prior, is made distinct, a shoot and root proceed from it. This, then, is the means by which it receives nourishment, since the plant needs to grow" (ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπέρμασιν ἐν αὐτοῖς [παραπλήσιον ποιεῖ τοῖς σπειρομένοις, b34] ἐστιν ἡ πρώτη· ὅταν δ' αὕτη ἀποκριθῇ ἐνοῦσα δυνάμει πρότερον, ἀπὸ ταύτης ἀφίεται ὅ τε βλαστὸς καὶ ἡ ῥίζα. αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ᾗ τὴν τροφὴν λαμβάνει· δεῖται γὰρ αὐξήσεως τὸ φυτόν).

[79] =[T85] in Chapter 5.

[80] Plutarch describes here the desire for philosophy and advancement with the metaphor of the shoot of a reed (ἡ τοῦ καλάμου βλάστησις) which naturally grows upward but faces setbacks due to periodic lack of nourishment and adverse conditions. See [T57] in Chapter 3.

[81] I discuss *On Listening to Lectures* 47C5–6 and *On Moral Progress* 76F7–77C6, 77C8–10 at greater length in §V of Chapter 3.

[82] Cf. Boys-Stones 2014.

Cleverness of Animals 962A6–B1).[83] It is, as Plutarch writes, the "seed that bears the fruit of justice" (φερέκαρπον σπέρμα πρὸς δικαιοσύνην, *On Affection for Offspring* 495B9–C6).

In Chapter 1, I discussed Plutarch's "Affection Account" and the role that φιλοστοργία plays in our orientation to others. There I proposed that the Affection Account is a construction derived from Chrysippus' examples of the explanatory power of the Stoic foundational theory of ethics (οἰκείωσις). While Plutarch never endorses the Stoic theory, and, in fact, as we saw in previous chapters, gives reasons why we ought to reject the end-goal of the dispassionate sage as both impossible and undesirable, he nevertheless holds that a pattern of behavior found in our earliest moments, as well as in non-rational animals, reveals a non-rational passionate drive at the core of human sociability and the virtuous life lived in communion with others, i.e. Plutarch supports the general features of the Affection Account. Unlike what we find in Stoic οἰκείωσις, however, Plutarch's emphasis is on the foundation of social virtues that begin with our passions.[84] Plutarch, I propose, presents an alternative "cradle argument" that reveals the importance of passions to our lives from our nature observed from birth.[85]

Beginning with Plutarch's notion of φιλοστοργία, he expands the semantic range beyond the usage we find in his predecessors, such as Plato, Aristotle, and Philo of Alexandria. In each of these authors, φιλοστοργία centers on affection felt between parents and their

[83] Contrast Plutarch's position with Porphyry's view that οἰκείωσις is a *capacity* for being a member of the moral community but is not a *principle* or *starting-point* in the sense of leading to the virtue of justice (*On Abstinence from Eating Flesh* 3.19=*SVF* 1.197; cf. Boys-Stones 2014, p. 309, n. 20).
[84] I turn to the topic of Plutarch's appropriation of οἰκείωσις in the next section.
[85] Cradle arguments draw on observable behavior of children in particular, though often also on the behavior of non-human animals, to explain natural impulses of human nature that fit with one's own view of human nature and are thought to comport with one's own theory of ethics and lead to it. On the role of cradle arguments among the different Hellenistic schools see Bruschwig 1986. On Stoic οἰκείωσις as a form of cradle argument, cf. also Klein 2016.

offspring.[86] Plutarch uses φιλοστοργία to describe both parents' love for their children[87] and children's love for parents,[88] love between siblings,[89] and even love between spouses.[90] This expansion reflects the first steps in the outward motion that φιλοστοργία initiates. Plutarch does not deny that the love between children and parents is a fundamental and primary form of friendship that is natural (ἡ πρώτη φιλία), but he sees this affection as more inclusive, since immediate love between siblings is also a natural primary friendship (*On Brotherly Love* 479C9–D2). Starting with the natural passion of φιλοστοργία, seen especially in the central case of parents' care for their offspring, we begin a progressive process of establishing relationships with others until we reach a point in which our relations with others outside our family exhibit the virtue of justice (*On Affection for Offspring* 495B9–C6).

One of the first indications that this is possible can be found in the further extension beyond the examples listed above to children who are not our own and to slaves:

[T107] ἐχούσης…τι τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγαπητικὸν ἐν ἑαυτῇ καὶ πεφυκυίας…τὸ φιλόστοργον ἀλλότριοι καὶ νόθοι παῖδες ἢ θεράποντες εἰσοικισάμενοι καὶ καταλαβόντες.

---

[86] Geert Roskam, in a study of Plutarch's *On Affection for Offspring*, gives a history of the term and concept of φιλοστοργία / τὸ φιλοστοργόν (2011, pp. 180–4). For convenience, I will use φιλοστοργία as shorthand for both φιλοστοργία and instances of τὸ φιλοστοργόν. From at least the time of Plato's *Laws*, φιλοστοργία denotes passions and affections shared between parents and children, and in some cases also between siblings. In the *Laws*, for instance, children feel affection for their elders (11, 927a8–b7). In Aristotle's works, the term is used exclusively for animals, as perhaps a kind of demotion of the term from the status of a cognitive emotion, since animals are incapable of cognitive emotions for Aristotle but show a semblance of love in their affection and care for their young (for which see Sorabji 1993, pp. 55–8). In Philo's works, we find φιλοστοργία restricted in use to the love between parents and children (see citations in Roskam 2011, p. 183). On Plutarch's expanded usage cf. Panagopoulos 1977, pp. 214–15.

[87] *Bravery of Women* 258D; *Consolation to his Wife* 698C, 609A, 609E; *Table-Talk* 634E; *On the Cleverness of Animals* 962A; *Pericles* 1.1; *Demosthenes* 22.2. Cf. Roskam 2011, p. 184 and n. 47. Cf. also Håland 2011, p. 22, who explores primarily a mother's love for children as a central case. In *On Brotherly Love*, Plutarch writes that parents have no say in whether they feel affection for their children: "Nature does not give authority to judgment for benevolence nor await the proverbial measure of salt but gives birth to the starting-point of friendship [together with the birth of the child]" (ἡ φύσις ἡγεμονίαν τῇ κρίσει πρὸς εὔνοιαν οὐ δίδωσιν οὐδ' ἀναμένει τὸν θρυλούμενον τῶν ἁλῶν μέδιμνον ἀλλὰ συγγεγέννηκε τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς φιλίας). The love for offspring is automatic and not developed by continued association (cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.3, 1156b25–9) and is not within one's power to deny.

[88] *On Brotherly Love* 483C. Cf. Roskam *ad loc*.

[89] *On Brotherly Love* 479C9–D2; *Fabius Maximus* 21.1; Cato The Younger 11.1–3. Cf. Roskam *ad loc*.

[90] *Letter of Consolation to Apollonius* 106B; *Advice to Bride and Groom* 140D and 144F; *Agis* 17.2; *Cleomenes* 1.2; *Dion* 51.3; *Brutus* 13.3. Cf. Roskam 2011, p. 183 and n. 46.

> The soul even has a certain natural love in itself…illegitimate children who have no relation to us and slaves take possession of our affection and settle to become occupants of it. (Plutarch, *Solon* 7.2)[91]

This expansion could be an exception and error in the direction our affections take. Before this expansion beyond one's natural kin in [T107], the bonds of affection appear to be founded on what would today fall under the concept of a biological mandate to preserve offspring and one's genetic inheritance. Conjugal affection even fits such a goal in promoting one's offspring through conjoined parental care and shared heritable traits.[92] Extending the domain of affection's application outside of one's natural family to adopted children and slaves, however, does not fit into these ways of viewing the proper objects of our affection.

A further objection to the natural expansion of affection might be drawn from Plutarch's biographical work on Pericles, where affection for offspring is described as misplaced:

[T108] ξένους τινὰς ἐν Ῥώμῃ πλουσίους κυνῶν ἔκγονα καὶ πιθήκων ἐν τοῖς κόλποις περιφέροντας καὶ ἀγαπῶντας ἰδὼν ὁ Καῖσαρ ὡς ἔοικεν ἠρώτησεν, εἰ παιδία παρ' αὐτοῖς οὐ τίκτουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες, ἡγεμονικῶς σφόδρα νουθετήσας τοὺς τὸ φύσει φιλητικὸν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ φιλόστοργον εἰς θηρία καταναλίσκοντας, ἀνθρώποις ὀφειλόμενον.

> When Caesar saw certain wealthy foreigners in Rome carrying and fawning on puppies and baby monkeys at their bosoms, he asked, as one reasonably would, whether the women did not have children they had given birth to among their own people, very masterfully criticizing those who waste the love and affection that is natural within us on beasts when it is owed to humans. (Plutarch, *Pericles* 1.1)

There is a misapplication of love and affection described in [T108], but it is in terms of *species*. Plutarch praises Caesar's criticism of what he considers to be outlandish behavior but makes no

[91] I am surprised that Roskam 2011 does not mention this extension.

[92] While such an explanation would need to be adapted for Plutarch and philosophers of his time, we already find in Plato's *Symposium* the idea that offspring are an extension of oneself, as though one might attain immortality through a series of descendants (206c1–208b6). There is a sense of purpose or explanation of care through tracked inheritance, the extension of oneself to one's offspring, an idea adumbrated in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 196–7.

gesture to restrict affection to one's own family members in this passage. It is, then, still an open question whether the extension in [T107] is an error or natural expansion of affection outside one's own natural familial relations.

Several other passages, however, confirm that affection follows an outward moving pattern to other humans, so that the expansion of affection in [T107] is not an aberration or misapplication but part of a natural progression. In a passage aimed against a Stoic target, for instance, Plutarch has his interlocutors argue that it seems odd to grant a capacity for φιλοστοργία to animals, but then to deny that they can attain its end:

[T109] ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν οὐδ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις, ὦ Σώκλαρε, τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἄτοπον εἶναι δοκεῖ· τὴν γοῦν πρὸς τὰ ἔκγονα φιλοστοργίαν ἀρχὴν μὲν ἡμῖν κοινωνίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης τιθέμενοι, πολλὴν δὲ τοῖς ζῴοις καὶ ἰσχυρὰν ὁρῶντες παροῦσαν, οὔ φασιν αὐτοῖς οὐδ᾽ ἀξιοῦσι μετεῖναι δικαιοσύνης.

> But, Soclarus, this does not seem to those very men [our opponents] to be strange: they posit affection for offspring, at any rate, as the beginning of our social relations and justice and observe that it is present in animals in abundance and with great force, but they assert and claim that animals have no share in justice.
>
> (Plutarch, *On the Cleverness of Animals* 962A–B1)

Plutarch, in the context of another work that we will discuss next, denies that animals can attain the virtue of justice. Plutarch does not, however, deny that φιλοστοργία is in some sense foundational as a starting-point for human social interaction and also for justice in humans (ἀρχὴν μὲν ἡμῖν κοινωνίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης). Instead, he seems to agree with his Stoic opponents that justice is indeed the end-goal (τέλος) of φιλοστοργία in *human* development.[93]

In another polemical passage, Plutarch affirms that affection is at the core of our sociability and even calls φιλοστοργία the "seed of justice":

[T110] τοῖς μὲν ἀλόγοις τὸ πρὸς τὰ ἔγγονα φιλόστοργον ἀτελὲς καὶ οὐ διαρκὲς πρὸς δικαιοσύνην οὐδὲ τῆς χρείας ῥορρωτέρω προερχόμενον ἔδωκεν, ἄνθρωπον δέ, λογικὸν καὶ πολιτικὸν ζῷον, ἐπὶ δίκην καὶ νόμον εἰσάγουσα καὶ θεῶν τιμὰς καὶ

[93] On the "Affection Account" see §VI of Chapter 1.

> πόλεων ἱδρύσεις καὶ φιλοφροσύνην, γενναῖα καὶ καλὰ καὶ φερέκαρπα τούτων σπέρματα παρέσχε τὴν πρὸς τὰ ἔγγονα χάριν καὶ ἀγάπησιν, ἀκολουθοῦσαν ταῖς πρώταις ἀρχαῖς.
>
> To non-rational animals [nature] has given a love for offspring that is imperfect, not sufficient for achieving justice, and which does not extend farther than utility, but to humans, rational and political animals, by introducing them to justice, law, the honors due to the gods, the foundings of cities, and friendliness, nature has given favor and love for offspring as seeds that are noble, and fruitful for producing all these things. This love and favor for offspring attends to their first beginnings.
>
> (Plutarch, *On Affection for Offspring* 495B9–C6)

Plutarch makes affection the seed whose fruit is a host of features that belong to human sociability and civilization. Love of offspring, described as both φιλοστοργία and ἀγάπησις in an example of *variatio*,[94] is the seed that bears the fruit (φερέκαρπον σπέρμα) of justice, law, honor due to the gods, the founding of cities, and friendliness in general. Our entire social life begins with this affection, Plutarch writes, which runs through every aspect of our orientations to others, including even our relations to the gods.[95] Affection (φιλοστοργία), then, cannot be limited to promoting one's own descendants, but must involve one's interactions with other humans more generally, up to the point that we seek just relations among other humans.

Thus far, the inclusive nature of φιλοστοργία, moving from the love between parents and offspring to other humans, appears similar to the Stoic definition of affection as applicable to one's friends as well as relatives (φίλοι καί οἰκεῖοι).[96] In the Stoic definition, however,

---

[94] *Contra* Nygren 1969, ἀγάπη and other terms for love and affection are often interchangeable or overlap in sense both in Plutarch's works as well as in Plato's dialogues. See Plato, *Phaedrus* 253a6; Plutarch, *On Compliancy* 528F1–4, *Solon* 7.2, *Pericles* 1.1.

[95] Cf. Roskam 2011, p. 194, who notes that this last feature is unique in Plutarch and not to be found in any Stoic account. Given my argument in Chapter 1, I agree, but my own view is that the Affection Account does not begin as a legitimate version of the Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις, so I would not expect to find the Stoics ascribing to affection the foundations of our relationship to the gods any more than I would expect affection to be foundational to other social interactions on the Stoic theory.

[96] In the Stoic definition, "it is a certain skill concerned with the love of friends or relatives" (φιλοτεχνία τις οὖσα περὶ στέρξιν φίλων ἢ οἰκείων, Clement, *Miscellanies* 2.9.41.6=*SVF* 3.292). As Roskam notes (2011, p. 181), this is a rather broad definition. See also Hierocles' outward movement of οἰκείωσις in Stob. 4.27.23 (p. 671, l. 7–p. 673, l. 11)=LS 57G.

φιλοστοργία is a pro-attitudinal disposition of benevolence, a good feeling (εὐπάθεια), but not a passion.[97] It represents a necessary standing attitude that a sage must have to qualify as a sage, but it cannot involve the vulnerability and sense of identification Plutarch sees as essential to true benevolence.[98] For Plutarch, who follows the non-Stoic understanding of the concept,[99] φιλοστοργία is a passion and involves identifying with the concerns and well-being of others.[100]

Plutarch gives some explanation for why affection is the beginning of our social life in his *Dialogue on Love*. Affection draws us out of ourselves into our social roles through a sense of *assimilated* identity. In Plato's *Republic*, the city-planners are to foster a sense of shared identity with pleasures and pains felt in common between the guardian and philosopher-ruler classes (5, 462c2–d5). Alluding to this passage, Plutarch writes:

[T111] "στέργεσθαι" δὲ καὶ "στέργειν" ἑνί μοι δοκεῖ γράμματι τοῦ στέγειν παραλλάττον εὐθὺς ἐμφαίνειν τὴν ὑπὸ χρόνου καὶ συνηθείας ἀνάγκῃ μεμιγμένην εὔνοιαν. ᾧ δ' ἂν Ἔρως ἐπισκήψῃ ... καὶ ἐπιπνεύσῃ, πρῶτον μὲν ἐκ τῆς Πλατωνικῆς πόλεως "τὸ ἐμὸν" ἕξει καὶ "τὸ οὐκ ἐμόν"· οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῶς "κοινὰ τὰ φίλων"…ἀλλ' οἳ τοῖς σώμασιν ὁριζόμενοι τὰς ψυχὰς βίᾳ συνάγουσι καὶ συντήκουσι, μήτε βουλόμενοι δύ' εἶναι μήτε νομίζοντες.

> The fact that "feeling affection and loving," differs from "covering and protecting" by a single letter, seems to me to indicate that benevolence comes of necessity from being joined together over time and from familiarity. Whomever Love falls upon…and inflames, at first will consider "what's mine" and "what's not mine" as it is considered in Plato's *Republic* [5, 462c2–3], since it is simply not the case that "all things are common between friends" [4, 424a2 and 449c5]…but [it is true] between those who, although separated by their bodies, bring their souls together per force and fuse them together, not desiring nor considering themselves to be two individuals any more.
>
> (Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love* 767D5–E2)

Love and affection draw one to see others not just as another self (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*

[97] See n. 115 in Chapter 1.
[98] See Chapter 1, §IV.
[99] Namely, the tradition we find exemplified in Plato's *Laws* and in Aristotle's and Philo's works.
[100] Love (ἔρως) in addition to φιλοστοργία is a passion (πάθος) for Plutarch (*On Love*=Sandbach fr. 134=Stob. 4.20.34).

9.4–10),[101] but as the *same self*. Drawing on the image from Aristophanes' speech in the *Symposium* (192d2–e9), one's identity is melded and fused together with others through affection, drawing one outside one's concern for oneself to the exclusion of others, to the inclusion of others in the concern for oneself.[102] The good man (ὁ χρηστός), Plutarch writes, is seen

[T4] καὶ τὸ κηδεμονικὸν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον οὐ χρείαις οὐδὲ πράξεσι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ συναλγεῖν πταίουσι καὶ κατορθοῦσι συγχαίρειν ἐπιδεικνύμενος.

displaying both his care and friendliness toward others, not only by his useful actions, but also by sharing in the grief of their misfortunes and sharing in the joy of their successes. (Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft* 823A9–B1)

He exhibits true benevolence (εὔνοια) and affection, which involve sharing in the joys and pains of one another (συγχαίρειν καὶ συναλγεῖν, Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451E4–6).[103]

Our affection, expressed by στέργεσθαι and στέργειν in [T111], is foundational to our shared life together. Not only is it at the core of how we meet our obligations to care for children or associate with other citizens, but it also is found at work in the most intimate of our relationships. Affection brings us to identify with others to the point of "unification and shared nature" (ἡνωμένος καὶ συμφυής, Plutarch, *Advice to Bride and Groom* 142E12–F8[104]), "fusing souls together" (τὰς ψυχὰς συντήκουσι, *Dialogue on Love* 767D5–E2=[T111]) and achieving

[101] See esp. 9.4, 1166a31–2; 9.9, 1170a2–4, 1170b6–7; 8.10, 1159b2–4. Cf. *Eudemian Ethics* 7.12, 1245a29–35. Cf. also Price 1989, p. 130.
[102] *Pace* Roskam 2004b, I do not see Plutarch as falling into the camp of those who formulate one's concern for others as a means "to act *oneself* in a virtuous way" (p. 249), as though others were a means to one's own fulfillment of actualization in virtue, "used as a mere means to reach one's own τέλος of a φιλία πρὸς ἑαυτόν" (pp. 250–251). Roskam is concerned with analyzing how well we can understand Plutarch to have respected the views of others, both in his moral theory and in his practice as an author writing on different individuals and their views. *Contra* Roskam's view, I have tried to place emphasis more on Plutarch's view that we share our lives together by identifying with others, rather than to highlight, as Roskam sees it, Plutarch's failure to respect others' views when they conflict with Plutarch's own.
[103] =[T5] in Chapter 1.
[104] =[T60] in Chapter 3.

"total blending" (δι' ὅλων κρᾶσις, 766F3–5).[105]

§IV Plutarch, Identification (οἰκείωσις), and Becoming Like God (ὁμοίωσις θεῷ)

As should become clear from the preceding section, Plutarch "appropriates," so to speak, the Stoic theory of identification / appropriation (οἰκείωσις) but modifies it in order to improve upon what he finds to be its deficiencies.[106] Let me quickly retrace the steps. As we saw in Chapter 1 (§IV–§VI), Plutarch finds fault with the end-goal (τέλος) of Stoic ethical development founded on their theory of οἰκείωσις. The Stoic sage, the exemplar of virtue we are to emulate, fails to have true benevolence (εὔνοια ἀληθινή) according to Plutarch, because he is dissociated from his own passionate nature and has made his own human nature callous.[107] He is insulated from others by his invulnerability; he is unaffected by whether or not he succeeds in benefitting others, and the condition of others in no way affects his own virtue or happiness.

Drawing on what I called the Affection Account of οἰκείωσις in Chapter 1, Plutarch endorses a kind of starting-point (ἀρχή) for the shared life of communal living with the non-rational passion of φιλοστοργία, a passion that we do not dispense with as we mature and progress in the ethical life that we share with others. As we found at the end of the last section,

---

[105] On the Stoic notion of total blending and other types of cohesion see §VI and n. 78 in Chapter 3.
Affection need not and cannot lead to such a total fusion with every human soul in one's life. We cannot be friends with everyone in the same way (Plutarch, *On Having Many Friends* 93F3–94A1). As in obligations and our ability to socialize with our families, neighbors, and fellow citizens, affection comes in degrees. Albeit the extreme case is unfeasible, this passage describes a pattern of identifying our concern and interests with others that emerges from the first root of passionate affiliation. Cf. Van der Stockt 2011, esp. pp. 25 and 29.

[106] Karamanolis (2006, p. 122) is correct to point to *On Common Notions* 1060D2–E8 for Plutarch's argument, similar to Antiochus', that it makes little sense for the Stoics to argue that we are oriented to appropriate goods that are indifferent to happiness, which is achieved through virtue alone. In so doing, he aligns himself with Aristotle, Xenocrates, and Polemo (*On Common Notions* 1069E–F; cf. Dillon 2003 (pp. 139–40 and 161–2) on this passage), to improve upon the Stoic theory. Cf. also Boys-Stones 2014 (p. 299), who alludes to Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love* 759E6–7 and the description of ἔρως as a power that is oriented to what is beautiful (δύναμις… οἰκειωτικὴ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν). Karamanolis and Boys-Stones, however, do not attend to the "Affection Account" of social identification as I have developed it here and to what I consider Plutarch's more revolutionary attempt to correct the account of social identification and join it together with the Platonic ideal of becoming like god.

[107] Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451E4–6; *On Brotherly Love* 483C4–7; *Letter of Consolation to Apollonius* 102C5–E1=[T15] in Chapter 1.

the care and concern for others that Plutarch has in mind begins from φιλοστοργία and draws us to see others as ourselves and to *identify* their interests as our own (οἰκεῖον), even sharing in their sense of well-being and emotions outside of what is within our own power to choose (ἐφ' ἡμῖν) in our emotional lives. Our joy and grief is affected by others (τὸ συγχαίρειν καὶ συναλγεῖν, Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 451E4–6; τῷ συναλγεῖν πταίουσι καὶ κατορθοῦσι συγχαίρειν, *Precepts of Statecraft* 823A9–B1). By altering the Stoic account of οἰκείωσις as starting from the passion of φιλοστοργία, Plutarch outlines a pathway to communal life and justice that not only begins from a non-rational passion, but also continues to incorporate the emotional vulnerability he sees as necessary to genuine benevolence and concern for others. We will see shortly that this emotional attachment remains a part of Plutarch's view of the fulfillment of human nature in the imitation of god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ).

Unlike the Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις, which is intended to explain the foundations of ethical development up to the *summum bonum* of becoming perfected in virtue, Plutarch's version of identification through φιλοστοργία, though it lies at the beginning of our social lives, does not fully explain one's progress to becoming virtuous and reaching the end-goal of human nature. Like other passionate seeds of virtue, φιλοστοργία requires cultivation by reason. Additionally, this non-rational passion does not provide our conception of the good. To explain how we acquire a conception of the good and achieve the end-goal of fulfillment in our human nature, Plutarch turns to the Platonic goal of becoming like god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ, Plato, *Theaetetus* 176a5–b2).[108]

[108] Gerson (1994, p. 263, n. 56) believes that this goal is described also in Plato's *Republic* 1, 352a; 2, 383c; 10, 610a and 621b; in *Phaedo* 78c; and in *Phaedrus* 249c. Mahoney (2004, p. 321, n. 1) also identifies *Phaedo* 79d and *Phaedrus* 248a as key passages, adding *Timaeus* 90a and *Laws* 4, 715c–716d. Cf. Alcinous, *Handbook* 28; Arius Didymus claims that even Socrates thought this was the goal (Stob. 2.7.3f (p. 49, ll. 8–9)). On Alcinous and becoming like god see Whittaker 1990, p. 137, n. 451, and Sedley 2012.

For Plutarch, as we will see in passages below, one is to emulate god not only through intellectual virtue to come to an understanding of what is good (*On Isis and Osiris* 382D4–E2[109]; *On Quietude*=Sandbach fr. 143[110]) but also through moral virtue, with qualities that aim at benefitting others.[111] Plutarch is quite emphatic on this point, more so than is sometimes appreciated.[112] The goal of becoming like god is sometimes thought to be merely the act of

---

[109] Plutarch couches the contemplation of god in language alluding to initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries, drawing the contemplation of god together with the *Symposium*'s attainment of union with the Form of Beauty and the Good (210a1): "The intellection of what is intelligible, pure, and simple, like a lightning-bolt illumining throughout the entire soul, lets one touch and see it once. For this reason Plato [*Symposium* 210a1] and Aristotle call this the 'viewing' part of philosophy, insofar as those who move past objects of appearance, mixture, and variation through reason and make the jump to that which is first, pure, simple, and immaterial, when they in fact actually touch the pure truth of it, consider it to be as though they have reached the fulfillment and end of the Mysteries of philosophy" (ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ εἰλικρινοῦς καὶ ἁπλοῦ νόησις ὥσπερ ἀστραπὴ διαλάμψασα τῆς ψυχῆς, ἅπαξ ποτὲ θιγεῖν καὶ προσιδεῖν παρέσχε. διὸ καὶ Πλάτων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης "ἐποπτικὸν" τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς φιλοσοφίας καλοῦσιν, καθ' ὅσον οἱ τὰ δοξαστὰ καὶ μικτὰ καὶ παντοδαπὰ ταῦτα παραμειψάμενοι τῷ λόγῳ πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον ἐκεῖνο καὶ ἁπλοῦν καὶ ἄυλον ἐξάλλονται καὶ θιγόντες ἀληθῶς τῆς περὶ αὐτὸ καθαρᾶς ἀληθείας οἷον ἐν τελετῇ τέλος ἔχειν φιλοσοφίας νομίζουσι). On the allusions to the Eleusinian Mysteries (τελετή) and "viewing" the mysteries (ἐποπτεία / τὸ ἐποπτικόν), see also n. 119 below. On Plutarch's fusion of imitating and contemplating god with union and contemplation of the Forms and the Demiurge of the *Timaeus* see Jones 1926, p. 325; O'Brien 2015, pp. 85–6; Reydams-Schils 2017, pp. 154–6.

[110] =Stob. 4.16.18 (p. 398, ll. 7–10): "The possession of quietude seems to be something wise, especially for the practice of knowledge and wisdom. I do not mean that of a merchant or what is associated with buying and selling, but that great [knowledge and wisdom] which makes the one who receives it like god" (σοφὸν ἔοικε χρῆμα τὸ τῆς ἡσυχίας πρός τ᾽ ἄλλα καὶ εἰς ἐπιστήμης καὶ φρονήσεως μελέτην· λέγω δ᾽ οὐ τὴν καπηλικὴν καὶ ἀγοραίαν ἀλλὰ τὴν μεγάλην, ἥτις ἐξομοιοῖ θεῷ τὸν αὐτὴν ἀναλαβόντα). While Dillon (1977, pp. 192–3) takes this passage to be evidence that Plutarch is rejecting *all* practical wisdom in favor of contemplative and theoretical wisdom, that conclusion is not warranted. What Plutarch denies is that knowledge and wisdom associated with trade, a kind of cleverness, which he goes on to describe as "so-called keenness of mind, but really knavery" (τὴν λεγομένην δριμύτητα, πανουργίαν οὖσαν, ll. 11–13) contributes to one's assimilation to the divine.

[111] Cf. Brenk 2012, who explores Plutarch's monotheistic notions vis-à-vis other Middle Platonists and Egyptian, Jewish, and Christian views of monotheism, arguing that Plutarch believes that the supreme deity is personal in nature and fits with the descriptions of god in philosophical tradition that he inherits. This monotheistic trend in Plutarch does not, however, deny the existence or activity of *lesser* deities. Cf. also Dillon 2001a; Lanzillotta 2012; and O'Brien 2015, pp. 83–116.

Plutarch also rejects the idea of god as self-centered and only contemplating his own nature in *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 426C1–D8, which he attributes to Aristotle, arguing that the supreme deity takes delight in watching over this world and the creatures therein. He also exhibits care and providence (ἐπιμέλεια καὶ πρόνοια) over what he has created. Plutarch seems to have passages such as *Eudemian Ethics* 7.12, 1245b14–19; *Metaphysics* Λ 7, 1072b14–30; and *ibid*. Λ 9, 1074b15–1075a10 in mind in his criticism of Aristotle's view.

[112] Cf. Karamanolis, 2006, pp. 122–3, and 2014 ("6. Ethics and Politics"). Although Karamanolis notes that Plutarch's ideal life involves a political and practical dimension, it is practically as a footnote to the ideal that, as Karamanolis believes, Plutarch advocates in terms of the contemplative life through theoretical reason alone, apart from passions and the active life. The same is true for Dillon 1977, pp. 192–8. Bonazzi 2012b (pp. 149–50), to whom I will refer below, Boys-Stones (2014, pp. 317–18 and nn. 35–6), drawing on Bonazzi 2012b, and Reydams-Schils 2017 (pp. 154–8) appreciate the practical and ethical dimensions in Plutarch's ideal, but do not develop the point as I do here. Cf. also Duff 1999, pp. 66 and 75, and Boys-Stones 2017, pp. 460–3.

contemplating truth through theoretical intellect (θεωρητικὸς νοῦς), dissociated from society and one's own passionate nature, which Julia Annas describes as the problem of becoming "unworldly" or "some other kind of being" rather than fulfilling one's own human nature.[113] While Plutarch describes an afterlife goal of transcending human nature,[114] he lays greater

[113] Annas 1999, pp. 54–71. On the interpretation that the goal of assimilation to god is to become something radically different from what we are as human creatures, Annas (1999, p. 56) writes "Surely this is in itself an odd idea of virtue: how could virtue lie in altering yourself into some other kind of being?" She continues by describing the oddity that "it is in transcending our human nature, not fulfilling it, that we find happiness" (pp. 57–8). Among Plato's dialogues, Annas (1999, pp. 70–1) sees Plato's goal of assimilation to god as creating a tension between the contemplative life and the life of practical virtues: "There is a rift in Plato's thought, as he is torn between conceptions of virtue as, on the one hand, an uncompromising but committed engagement with the world and, on the other, a flight from and rejection of it…. We can sympathize with both…. But it is not possible to combine these strands into a single set of ideas; one or other will suffer too much strain." To help shed light on attempted resolutions to this tension, Annas draws upon Plotinus' division of higher, intellectual virtues and lower, civic and moral virtues (πολιτικαὶ ἀρεταί) in Plotinus' *Enneads* 1.2 (pp. 66–71). Though she notes that this division may succeed in drawing the different notions of moral and intellectual virtue apart, it leaves the problem of which life is to take precedence. Sedley (1997 and 1999, pp. 316–28) presents a similar view in which imitation of god as incarnate beings in Plato's dialogues involves contemplation of the divine with circular thoughts, dissociating oneself from one's mortal passions and nature, and moving past moral virtues to the purely intellectual virtue of contemplation. See also Festugière 1950, Merki 1952. *Contra* this interpretation, cf. Hackforth 1936 and Menn 1992 (pp. 555–8) and 1995 (pp. 6–18), who argue that god in Plato's dialogues is to be identified with νοῦς and the Demiurge of the *Timaeus*, who acts in the world to make it as good as it can be. See also Neschke-Hentschke 1995 (pp. 207–16), Armstrong 2004, Mahoney 2004 and 2005, Silverman 2010 (pp. 84–7), and Bonazzi 2012b (p. 150), who argue, contrary to Festugière 1950, Merki 1952, Sedley 1997 and 1999, and Annas 1999, that imitation of god in Plato's works is active, looks to the good of others, and is achieved through moral virtues and practical action.

On the importance of ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ as the goal among Platonists, see Alcinous, *Handbook* 152.30–153.24 and 181.19–182.14; Stob. 2.7.3f (p. 49, l. 8–p. 50, l. 2); D.L. 3.78; Philo of Alexandria, *On Flight and Finding* 63; Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* 5.14, 95.1–96.2. Cf. Armstrong 2004, p. 172: "Ever since ancient Platonists such as Eudorus, Philo, and Alcinous, Plato's notion of 'becoming like god' (ὁμοίωσις θεῷ), or 'following god' (ἀκόλουθος θεῷ) has been understood to be a flight from this world to a higher one." For references see Armstrong 2004, p. 172, n. 2. Cf. also Dillon 1977, pp. 71 and 121. For a recent and concise discussion of the goal of becoming like god in Middle Platonists see Boys-Stones 2017, pp. 460–3. For the attribution of the formula "following god" to Pythagoras see Stob. 2.7.3f (p. 49, l. 16). Arius Didymus claims that Socrates and Plato agreed with Pythagoras in identifying becoming like god with following god, but, as Annas 1992 (p. 53, n. 4) argues, it is unclear to what extent this tradition is Neo-Pythagorean from Hellenistic times rather than from Pythagoras himself. See VII in Chapter 2. Cf. also Frede 1987.

[114] In a few places Plutarch describes the transcendence of human nature to pure, passionless intellection, by becoming a δαίμων (*On the Sign of Socrates* 593D2–8) when intellect (νοῦς) dissociates from the soul after death, which is left to dream on the surface of the moon apart from intellect (*On the Face in the Moon* 944E4–F5). Cf. Dillon 2001b, pp. 37–40, for further discussion of νοῦς and its relation to the human soul; cf. Babut 1969a, pp. 470–2, on divinization and transformation of the soul after death; cf. Jones 1916, pp. 27–40, and O'Brien 2015, pp. 83–116, on the relationship between different kinds of divine beings in Plutarch's works. See also n. 118 below on the different accounts of δαίμονες and their relationship to human souls and human passions.

In *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance*, we also see souls that undergo metempsychosis "because of the weakness of their reason and laziness in contemplation they sink to rebirth for practical action" (ἀσθενείᾳ λόγου καὶ δι' ἀργίαν τοῦ θεωρεῖν ἔρρεψε τῷ πρακτικῷ πρὸς γένεσιν, 565D7–8). This, however, is generally due to having lived a life of inordinate passions that entangle and weigh down the soul (565A8–67E3, esp. 566A).

emphasis on becoming like god with the whole of one's human nature in the embodied life, aimed at benefitting others and developing one's passions into the fully virtuous moral life (Plutarch, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550A1–10, C12–E5; *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780B8–792A5).[115]

Just as Plato's Demiurge attempts to make the universe the best it can be (Plato, *Timaeus* 29a1–b1, e1–3; *Laws* 10, 903b4–e1), for Plutarch, human imitation of the divine is manifest in ruling and controlling the soul in its passions and development of virtue as a microcosmic imitation of the Demiurge ruling the world-soul.[116] God, in fact, establishes himself as the model (παράδειγμα) to which we are to assimilate (ἐξομοίωσις πρὸς αὐτόν) through *human virtue* (ἀνθρωπίνη ἀρετή, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550D1–3).[117]

In *To an Uneducated Ruler*, Plutarch outlines a kind of process that one uses to become like god. He writes that the wise become imitators of god from philosophy (ἐκ φιλοσοφίας), which implants the disposition within them (ἐμποιεῖ τὴν διάθεσιν) as they mold themselves into

---

On the separation of νοῦς from soul in Plato's dialogues, see *Euthydemus* 287d7–e1; *Philebus* 30a9–10; *Timaeus* 37a2–4, 46d5–6; and *Sophist* 239a4–8. Cf. also Menn 1995, pp. 19–24, and Hackforth 1936, who argue that νοῦς can exist apart from the soul in the intelligible realm.

[115] Plutarch provides a division of labor between passionless intellectual virtue and impassioned moral virtue (*On Moral Virtue* 444A3–B1; *On the Sign of Socrates* 588D9–10). See §I of Chapter 3. Cf. Dillon 1977, pp. 193–8; Roskam 2005, pp. 312–20, and Gill 2006. While Karamanolis (2006, pp. 122–3, and 2014, "6. Ethics and Politics") and Dillon (1977, pp. 192–8) interpret this division as implying that only by intellectual virtues humans emulate god in Plutarch, I hope to show otherwise in this section. The post-mortem existence of pure contemplation is not the goal we are to seek while embodied in this life. Nor are we to seek death before the gods will it. Even in *On Tranquility of Mind* 476A10–C2, where Plutarch discusses the dissociation from passions at death, he seeks to alleviate the fear of death, not to praise the transition as something we should seek in this life. Cf. also Alt 1993, pp. 185–204. On the prohibition of suicide in Plato's *Phaedo* (64a4–c1), see Warren 2001, pp. 91–106, and Murray 2001, pp. 247–55.

[116] Plutarch, *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780B8–10; *Isis and Osiris* 382A4–B4; *On Moral Virtue* 441E8–442A5; *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1023D10–E7, 1025A–D, and 1026D. Cf. Reydams-Schils 2017 (p. 155), who argues that Plutarch moves beyond Plato's *Timaeus* in describing the Demiurge as the god humans are to emulate. Cf. Brenk 2012, p. 80, and O'Brien 2015, pp. 84–6. See also n. 111 above.

[117] "God, establishing himself at the center as the *model* of all things noble, provides for *human virtue* to be an *assimilation to himself* in some manner for those who are able to follow god." (πάντων καλῶν ὁ θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐν μέσῳ παράδειγμα θέμενος τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἀρετήν, ἐξομοίωσιν οὖσαν ἀμωσγέπως πρὸς αὐτόν, ἐνδίδωσι τοῖς ἕπεσθαι θεῷ δυναμένοις). Cf. Plato, *Laws* 4, 716b, *Phaedrus* 248a. Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.13, 1102a7–1103a10.

his image (782A1–5). They contemplate his nature. In their approach to becoming like god, they first observe that the sun is a physical imitation of god within the sensible realm (781F1–782A5). What they grasp is that the sun imitates the divine as a physical being, even though god is not physical (780F1–4), and that the sun's movement emulates the heavenly order, though not in an exactly identical pattern (Plutarch, *Phocion* 2.6–7). Likewise, human nature must also imitate god given the human condition, which involves the passionate nature, even though god does not have passions (*On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 420E2–6; *Marcius Coriolanus* 38.3–7[118]). So, although one contemplates the divine nature through reason alone (*Table-Talk* 718B7–D3)[119] to

[118] "For god in no way resembles anything human, not in nature, activity, skill, or strength" (οὐδενὶ γὰρ οὐδαμῶς ἀνθρωπίνῳ προσέοικεν οὔτε φύσιν οὔτε κίνησιν οὔτε τέχνην οὔτ' ἰσχύν, 38.6).

While god may not have passions, δαίμονες seem to share in both the power of god and the passionate nature of mortals (ἡ δαιμόνων φύσις ἔχουσα καὶ πάθος θνητοῦ καὶ θεοῦ δύναμιν, *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* 416D4–5). Some δαίμονες are said to be the souls of humans whose passions remain after death to differing degrees (417B4–9). A few δαίμονες become completely purified of passions and godlike (ἐκ δὲ δαιμόνων ὀλίγαι μὲν ἐν χρόνῳ πολλῷ δι' ἀρετὴν καθαρθεῖσαι παντάπασι θειότητος μετέσχον, 415B11–C1; cf. *On the Face in the Moon* 944E4–F5 and *Romulus* 28.10) while others return to mortal bodies (415C1–4). Other δαίμονες were never embodied and therefore were never human souls (431E1–3).

[119] Asking what it would mean for god to be doing geometry, Tyndares remarks that Plato often intimates that "geometry draws us away from turning toward sense-perception and turns us toward the intelligible and eternal nature, the sight of which is the goal of philosophy, just as 'viewing' is fulfillment of initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries" (γεωμετρίαν ὡς ἀποσπῶσαν ἡμᾶς προσισχομένους τῇ αἰσθήσει καὶ ἀποστρέφουσαν ἐπὶ τὴν νοητὴν καὶ ἀίδιον φύσιν, ἧς θέα τέλος ἐστὶ φιλοσοφίας οἷον ἐποπτεία τελετῆς, 718C9–D3). Cf. also *On Isis and Osiris* 382D4–E2: The intellection of what is intelligible, pure, and simple (ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ εἰλικρινοῦς καὶ ἁπλοῦ νόησις), which *both* Plato and Aristotle called the "viewing" part of philosophy (ἐποπτικὸν τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς φιλοσοφίας), is achieved by ascending past sense-perception to thought alone. The language here is reminiscent of Eleusinian Mysteries, wherein one would achieve the final viewing of the mysteries after initiation through the lower stages. Cf. Plato, *Symposium* 210a1. Cf. also Plutarch, *Alexander* 7.5· "It is likely that Alexander received [from Aristotle] not only instruction in ethics and politics, but also participated in the unspeakable and deeper teachings that men do not introduce to many, calling them by the special names of lessons in 'hearing' and 'viewing'" (ἔοικε δ' Ἀλέξανδρος οὐ μόνον τὸν ἠθικὸν καὶ πολιτικὸν παραλαβεῖν λόγον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀπορρήτων καὶ βαθυτέρων διδασκαλιῶν, ἃς οἱ ἄνδρες ἰδίως ἀκροατικὰς καὶ ἐποπτικὰς προσαγορεύοντες οὐκ ἐξέφερον εἰς πολλούς, μετασχεῖν). Though Aristotle never uses the term ἐποπτικόν, Plutarch seems to take it to be the pinnacle and fulfillment of philosophy (ἐν τελετῇ τέλος φιλοσοφίας, *On Isis and Osiris* 382E1–2), perhaps drawing together Aristotle's discussion of contemplation in the latter half of *Nicomachean Ethics* 10 (esp. 10.7, 1177a12–10.8, 1179a32) with contemplation of the Forms in Plato's dialogues, particularly *Republic* 7, 514a1–520e2, *Symposium* 210a4–212a7. Annas (1992, pp. 53–4, n. 4), however, argues that the passages on contemplation in the latter half of *Nicomachean Ethics* appear to have had little impact on the view of "Aristotelian" ethics during the Hellenistic period, which leads her to doubt that there was much access to these passages of Aristotle during this period. The connection Plutarch draws between Plato and Aristotle in terms of ἐποπτεία is evidence that Plutarch, at least, had access to the Aristotelian view on divine contemplation. Plutarch's criticism of Aristotle's god as self-centered in his contemplation is further evidence. See n. 111 above. Cf. also Inwood 2014, esp. pp. 22–3, 78–83, who argues that Aristotelian naturalistic ethics became the usual approach of Peripatetics after Aristotle.

see the image of god in the sun (*To an Uneducated Ruler* 780F8–781A4), one nevertheless imitates god through the *whole* person, including one's passions, as much as one is able, forming oneself into a likeness of god through virtue (αὐτὸς αὑτὸν εἰς ὁμοιότητα θεῷ δι᾽ ἀρετῆς καθιστάς, 780E9–F1).[120]

The purpose of philosophy, Plutarch writes, is to produce *living* and *active* imitations of god, not inert statues at which one would marvel:

[T112] οὐκ "ἀνδριαντοποιός" ἐστιν ὁ τῆς φιλοσοφίας λόγος, "ὥστ᾽ ἐλινύοντα ποιεῖν ἀγάλματ᾽ ἐπ᾽ αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος ἑσταότα" κατὰ Πίνδαρον· ἀλλ᾽ ἐνεργὰ βούλεται ποιεῖν ὧν ἂν ἅψηται καὶ πρακτικὰ καὶ ἔμψυχα, καὶ κινητικὰς ὁρμὰς ἐντίθησι καὶ κρίσεις ἀγωγοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ὠφέλιμα καὶ προαιρέσεις φιλοκάλους καὶ φρόνημα καὶ μέγεθος μετὰ πραότητος καὶ ἀσφαλείας, δι᾽ ὧν τοῖς ὑπερέχουσι καὶ δυνατοῖς ὁμιλοῦσιν οἱ πολιτικοὶ προθυμότερον.

> The purpose of philosophy is not "statue-making, with the result that one makes statues that rest without moving, standing still upon their own base" as Pindar puts it [*Nemean Ode* 5.1–3], but it is wont to make whatever it touches active, effective, and full of life. It establishes within one active impulses and judgments that lead to what is beneficial, policies that aim at what is noble, and thoughtfulness and greatness with gentleness and security. Through these characteristics those engaged in politics more eagerly associate with those who are powerful and in power.
>
> (Plutarch, *Philosophers and Men in Power* 776C8–D3)

---

[120] Cf. Bonazzi 2012b, p. 150, who argues that Plutarch is not only correct to stress the practical life as consequential upon the contemplative life, but also is correct in understanding Plato's own view in this interpretation: "Also in Plato, then, assimilation is not resolved in contemplation, but is a prerequisite for action. Indeed, Plutarch proves to be well aware of these Platonic reverberations. For sure, even granting that other Platonists (i.e. Antiochus or Alcinous) too have appreciated the weight of the practical consequences of *theoria*, Plutarch undeniably stood out among them as the one who stressed the importance of this aspect as the feature that best defines the nature of Platonism." Cf. also Price 1989 (pp. 50–1), who argues that union with the Forms leads to appropriate virtuous actions toward others, and Silverman 2010 (p. 87), who writes: "If I am right that Plato never intends us to hive off the practical from our model divine mind, it is because he is committed to the thesis that knowing the good entails not only being good, and being imperviously happy, it also entails doing good, in whatever circumstances one finds oneself in, to the extent that doing good is possible. By such an exercise of reason, one models oneself on the divine mind." Neschke-Hentschke (1995, pp. 207–16) also argues that assimilation to the divine includes practical action as an essential component. Speaking generally about Platonists, Boys-Stones (2017, p. 461) considers the goal of becoming like god and "flight" from this world to mean that one looks to the divine in contemplation and then acts in the world as a practical agent: "The Platonist definition of the end, in short, is not about swapping the human state for the divine, but about *bringing the divine values* to what we do as human beings…; not about becoming gods rather than humans…but realising what is divine in our humanity."

Xenocrates also appears to have considered imitation of god to include one's whole person. Happiness (εὐδαιμονία) is found in the soul that is morally virtuous (Aristotle, *Topics* 2.6, 112a36–8) and involves the passionate parts of the soul, which, as Xenocrates appears to have inferred from Plato's *Phaedrus*, are essential components of the soul. Cf. Sedley 1999, p. 322, nn. 18–19.

Drawing on the *Phaedrus*' image (252d5–e1), Plutarch up-ends the statue-making metaphor so that philosophy's goal and purpose for human development is to create something that is quite the opposite of a statue, namely, *practical* agents.[121] Philosophy makes everything active and effective that it touches (ἐνεργὰ καὶ πρακτικά).[122] As we saw in Chapter 3 (§I), practical action requires passions. The imitation of god, then, will be as creatures endowed with passions through the exercise of practical reason (πρακτικὸς λόγος), not as passionless creatures enrapt in the exercise of contemplative intellect (θεωρητικὸς νοῦς) alone, which produces no practical action.[123] As Plutarch additionally indicates in [T112], philosophy shapes and promotes certain impulses of soul, which are within the passionate nature, to seek after what is beneficial (ἐπὶ τὰ ὠφέλιμα). As imitators of god, humans promote and use certain passions for the benefit of their own constitution, activities, and, as will become more apparent in what follows, for the good of others.

---

[121] Cf. Irwin 1977, p. 269, who considers those treated like statues in the *Phaedrus* to be inert, passive recipients. *Contra* Irwin, cf. Price 1989, p. 101.

[122] Given this explanation, I take it that the goal outlined in *Table-Talk* 718C9–D3, i.e. contemplation of the divine, indicates the goal of philosophy in bringing us to an understanding of the pattern we are to imitate, but not bringing about the fulfillment of imitation as practical agents who confer benefits upon others.

[123] Cf. Karamanolis 2014 ("6. Ethics and Politics"): "To achieve this [becoming like god], one should let his intellect rule and get beyond having any emotions. This amounts to having and exercising theoretical virtue alone, which pertains to the intellect." *Contra* Karamanolis, who cites *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* 1092E as evidence that Plutarch advocates the renunciation of moral virtue and the passions *simpliciter* to achieve the state of human happiness and imitation of god, the passage indicates otherwise. The passage reads as follows: "the good that is proper to the soul, genuine and truly of the soul is not irrational or introduced from without, but is most rational, naturally growing from the theoretical part of the soul that loves to learn or from the practical and honor-loving part of thought" (οἰκεῖον δὲ τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ ψυχικὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ γνήσιον καὶ οὐκ ἐπείσακτον αὐτῶν τἀγαθόν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἄλογον, ἀλλ' εὐλογώτατον ἐκ τοῦ θεωρητικοῦ καὶ φιλομαθοῦς ἢ πρακτικοῦ καὶ φιλοκάλου τῆς διανοίας φυόμενον, 1092E5–8). Where Karamanolis believes that this indicates *only* theoretical reason without the passionate aspect of soul, he neglects to acknowledge that Plutarch also mentions that the good grows also from the *practical and honor-loving* part of the soul (τὸ πρακτικόν καὶ φιλόκαλον), which is passionate in nature and necessarily involved in moral virtues (see Chapter 3, §I). What the passage indicates is that the human good must be guided by reason, not by passions, but the latter are still necessary to the practical and moral life. Passions must be in harmony with reason, not opposed to it. Karamanolis also cites Tyrwhitt fr. 1.6–7 (p. 68 in Sandbach's Loeb edition), but (a) the general consensus is that this fragment is not a genuine work of Plutarch, and (b), like *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* 1092E, the passage does not indicate that "civic virtues" (πολιτικαὶ ἀρεταί, cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 430c, and *Phaedo* 82a; Plotinus, *Enneads* 1.2) occur without passion, but rather that the passionate part of the soul is affected and works simultaneously with reason as the passions are brought into measure by reason.

Coming now to the world-stage of human activities, Plutarch also considers human imitation of god to be manifest in the correct *ruling* of cities, which aims at benefitting its citizens by bringing about virtues, chiefly justice and the rule of law within the state (*To an Uneducated Ruler* 780D3–9, 780E5–F2; *Pericles* 15.1–2[124]). The act of ruling (ἀρχεῖν) is an imitation of the divine, since "a ruler is the image of the god who orders all things" (ἄρχων δ᾽ εἰκὼν θεοῦ τοῦ πάντα κοσμοῦντος, *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780E6–7). One imitates god as a "craftsman of justice" (δίκης δημιουργός, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550A1–10), Plutarch holds, just as the philosophic rulers of the *Republic* imitate the Demiurge of the *Timaeus*, becoming craftsmen of justice, moderation, civic virtues, and order in our world (δημιουργὸν σωφροσύνης τε καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ συμπάσης τῆς δημοτικῆς ἀρετῆς, Plato, *Republic* 6, 500d5–9[125]; *Timaeus* 29a3).[126]

To become like god, Plutarch writes, is to imitate his *beneficent qualities* more than his display of power as ruler.[127] With an outward focus, those who imitate god correctly attempt to emulate the type of ruler that he is, namely one who seeks the benefit of those whom he rules:

[T113] [ὁ θεὸς, 780E10] τοὺς δὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν ζηλοῦντας αὐτοῦ καὶ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον ἀφομοιοῦντας ἑαυτοὺς ἡδόμενος αὔξει καὶ μεταδίδωσι τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν εὐνομίας καὶ δίκης καὶ ἀληθείας καὶ πραότητος· ὧν θειότερον οὐ πῦρ ἐστιν οὐ φῶς οὐχ ἡλίου δρόμος οὐκ ἀνατολαὶ καὶ δύσεις ἄστρων οὐ τὸ ἀίδιον καὶ ἀθάνατον.

---

[124] =[T83] in Chapter 5.

[125] "'If, then,' I said, 'there is some compulsion for him to practice what he saw there, implanting and molding the character of people both in private and in public, not just his own character, do you suppose that he would himself become a bad craftsman of moderation, justice, and all the rest of the civic virtues?'" (ἂν οὖν τις, εἶπον, αὐτῷ ἀνάγκη γένηται ἃ ἐκεῖ ὁρᾷ μελετῆσαι εἰς ἀνθρώπων ἤθη καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ τιθέναι καὶ μὴ μόνον ἑαυτὸν πλάττειν, ἆρα κακὸν δημιουργὸν αὐτὸν οἴει γενήσεσθαι σωφροσύνης τε καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ συμπάσης τῆς δημοτικῆς ἀρετῆς;)

[126] Cf. Bonazzi 2012b, p. 150. Cf. also Reydams-Schils 2017, pp. 155–6, who argues that Plutarch, not Plato, is the one to make this connection between the philosophic-rulers' activity as craftsmen of moderation and virtue and the Demiurge of *Timaeus* 29a3.

[127] *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780F10–781A1: "God grows angry with those who imitate his thunderings, bolts of lightning, and rays of light" (νεμεσᾷ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀπομιμουμένοις βροντὰς καὶ κεραυνοὺς καὶ ἀκτινοβολίας).

> [God] gladly brings to increase those who emulate his virtue and make themselves like him in nobility and love for humanity, and grants to them a share of his own good order, justice, truth, and gentleness. Compared to these qualities, nothing is more divine, not fire, not light, not the course of the sun, nor the rising and setting of the stars, nor immortality and eternity. (Plutarch, *To an Uneducated Ruler* 781A1–7)

The qualities that one emulates in making oneself like god are characteristics aimed at care and concern for others, namely love for humans, good order, justice, and gentleness (τὸ φιλάνθρωπον…εὐνομία καὶ δίκη καὶ πραότης).[128] These other-regarding qualities, Plutarch claims, are more divine than the imitation of god's awe-inspiring power and even the divine qualities of immortality and eternity.[129] Drawing on his predecessor Polemo, Plutarch writes that our service to the gods is to look to the benefit of others. For Plutarch, unlike for Polemo, this activity follows from our imitation of the divine as ruler (ὁ ἄρχων) and is aimed not only at the salvation of and care for youths but for *others in general* (*To an Uneducated Ruler* 780D3–7[130]).[131]

The fulfillment of one's own nature, found in imitating god in the ordering of one's own

---

[128] Cf. Russell 1973, pp. 89–90: "What is notable in Plutarch is…the emphasis laid in all his moral judgments on mildness and humanity, *praotes* and *philanthropia*; these are qualities which, even if practiced in a self-regarding sense, involve at least some degree of concern and understanding for the feelings and aims of others." Gentleness is itself a divine portion of virtue (θεῖον…μόριον ἀρετῆς τὴν πραότητα, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 551C1–5). On gentleness (πραότης) in Plutarch see Martin 1960. Gentleness, as Martin notes (1960, p. 73, n. 27) is often linked with the virtue of justice (δικαιοσύνη) in Plutarch's writings (*Lycurgus* 28.13; *Timoleon* 37.5; *Cicero* 6.1; *Pelopidas* 26.8; *Pericles* 2.5; *Numa* 6.3; 20.4; *Lycurgus and Numa* 4.13). Cf. also Hirzel 1912, pp. 23–32; Martin 1961; and Alexiou 2008, pp. 371–2, for the concept of φιλανθρωπία in Plutarch. On the *personal* nature of god with benevolent and beneficent characteristics cf. Brenk 2012 and n. 111 above.

[129] Cf. Plutarch *Aristides* 6.5: Although we are disposed to desire the divine in terms of immortality (καίπερ οὕτω διακείμενοι τῆς μὲν ἀθανασίας ἐπιθυμοῦσι), it is not something that our nature can obtain (ἣν ἡ φύσις ἡμῶν οὐ δέχεται). Virtue (ἀρετή) is the only aspect of the divine we can and ought to emulate (μόνον ἐστὶ τῶν θείων ἀγαθῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν, ἐν ὑστέρῳ τίθενται). Cf. Plato, *Symposium* 206c1–208b6, where Diotima describes immortality as the goal that we all share. Sedley (1999, p. 310) considers this goal in the *Symposium* to be "Plato's first serious brush with the idea, so influential in his aftermath, that god sets the standard for all lower life forms to emulate." Plutarch, however, considers it a distracting goal that leads us away from the true imitation of god.

[130] For Polemo used to say that love is "service to the gods for the care and salvation of the youth, but one could more truly say that *rulers* serve god for the care and preservation of *humans*" (Πολέμων γὰρ ἔλεγε τὸν ἔρωτα εἶναι "θεῶν ὑπηρεσίαν εἰς νέων ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ σωτηρίαν"· ἀληθέστερον δ' ἄν τις εἴποι τοὺς ἄρχοντας ὑπηρετεῖν θεῷ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ σωτηρίαν). On the notion that service to the god is a form of assimilation to god, see Boys-Stone 2017, pp. 323–32, and 460.

[131] Cf. Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 4.3–4 and *Theseus and Romulus* 1.6; Cf. also Plato, *Symposium* 184d–e; *Phaedrus* 240d, wherein lovers are said to render service to their beloveds.

soul, thus moves us outside ourselves,[132] since it leads us to cultivate personal qualities that aim at the benefit of others.[133] After bringing their own souls into good order through reason and intelligence, Plutarch explains, individuals serve god in caring for and saving other individuals through political engagement (*Philosophers and Men in Power* 777C1–7[134]; *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780B8–10,[135] 780D3–7[136]; *Precepts of Statecraft* 799B1–8,[137] 800A11–B4[138]; *Phocion* 2.6–

[132] To be engrossed in concern for oneself (φιλαυτία) for Plutarch is a basic vice. See *How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend* 48E–49B and 65E–66A; *On Listening to Lectures* 40F; *Theseus and Romulus* 2.2; *Dion* 46.2. Cf. Ingenkamp 1971, pp. 131–2; Opsomer 1998, pp. 151–5; Van der Stockt 1999 (esp. p. 594, n. 46) and Roskam 2004b, pp. 251–2 and n. 22.

[133] On the concern for others, extending even to barbarians in Plutarch see Hirzel 1912, pp. 23–32. *Pace* Vlastos 1981 and Reshotko 2006, we find a similar pattern of self-fulfillment and benefaction toward others already in Plato's *Phaedrus*. The desire of the lover to improve the beloved is not self-interested in one's own self-improvement or progress. *Contra* Price (1989, pp. 96–102), neither is this desire aimed at one's own self-fulfillment in becoming immortalized through another, for which see Ferrari 1991, pp. 180–2.

[134] "The end-goal of both internal and uttered speech is friendship, with oneself [through internal speech] and with another [through uttered speech]. For the former [i.e. internals speech], coming to completion in virtue through philosophy, provides the man always as harmonious with himself, blameless in the eyes of others, and full of peace and friendliness toward himself" (καὶ τοῦ ἐνδιαθέτου λόγου καὶ τοῦ προφορικοῦ φιλία τέλος ἐστί, τοῦ μὲν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν τοῦ δὲ πρὸς ἕτερον. ὁ μὲν γὰρ εἰς ἀρετὴν διὰ φιλοσοφίας τελευτῶν σύμφωνον ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἄμεμπτον ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ μεστὸν εἰρήνης καὶ φιλοφροσύνης τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀεὶ παρέχεται τὸν ἄνθρωπον).

[135] "The ruler must first establish rule within himself and make straight his own soul and make firm his character and then in the same way make what is subject to his rule [in the city] in harmony with his character" ([δεῖ, 780B5] παραπλησίως τὸν ἄρχοντα πρῶτον τὴν ἀρχὴν κτησάμενον ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ κατευθύναντα τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ καταστησάμενον τὸ ἦθος οὕτω συναρμόττειν τὸ ὑπήκοον).

[136] Quoted in n. 130 above.

[137] The statesman "must turn himself to the understanding of the citizens' character, which is especially manifest as a mixture of all of their characters and is strong. For it is not easy or without risk for him to straightway attempt to form the character of the people and bring it into harmony, but it requires both a great deal of time and great power" (τρέπεσθαι χρὴ πρὸς κατανόησιν τοῦ ἤθους τῶν πολιτῶν, ὃ μάλιστα συγκραθὲν ἐκ πάντων ἐπιφαίνεται καὶ ἰσχύει. τὸ μὲν γὰρ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἐπιχειρεῖν ἠθοποιεῖν καὶ μεθαρμόττειν τοῦ δήμου τὴν φύσιν οὐ ῥᾴδιον οὐδ' ἀσφαλές, ἀλλὰ καὶ χρόνου δεόμενον πολλοῦ καὶ μεγάλης δυνάμεως).

[138] "The statesman, while in power and while he is trusted, ought then to try to bring the character of the citizens into harmony gently, leading them to what is better and handling them with delicacy" (τὸ μὲν οὖν τῶν πολιτῶν ἦθος ἰσχύοντα δεῖ καὶ πιστευόμενον ἤδη πειρᾶσθαι ῥυθμίζειν ἀτρέμα πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον ὑπάγοντα καὶ πράως μεταχειριζόμενον, 800A11–B2). To do this, one must bring one's own soul into harmony: "exercise and bring into order your own character" (ἐξάσκει καὶ κατακόσμει τὸν τρόπον, 800B4).

9[139]; *Dion* 10.1–3[140]).[141] Plutarch goes so far as to write that the greater accomplishment of philosophy, beyond what Plato wrote in his works on laws and constitutions, was the philosophy he implanted in the souls of his followers who worked to make the states in which they lived better (*Reply to Colotes* 1126B6–D7).[142] The virtuous, for Plutarch, seek to emulate god in bringing about justice (*Aristides* 6.3–5),[143] but one need not hold any office to act as a statesman,

---

[139] One emulates the sun, which, "as the mathematicians say, does not follow the heavenly movements with exactly the same movement" (ὥσπερ οὖν τὸν ἥλιον οἱ μαθηματικοὶ λέγουσι μήτε τὴν αὐτὴν τῷ οὐρανῷ φερόμενον φοράν), but because of its slight deviations, "everything on earth is preserved and receives the best temperature" (ᾗ σῴζεται πάντα καὶ λαμβάνει τὴν ἀρίστην κρᾶσιν). The ruler likewise is to imitate the heavenly, godlike pattern in the inexact pattern that will promote the benefit of the state and its citizens.

[140] Dion encourages the young ruler Dionysius II to seek philosophical education "so that, becoming ordered in his character toward virtue by reason, and becoming like the most divine and most beautiful pattern of reality, which, because everything obeys it as its leader, the world is ordered from a disorderly state, he might acquire great happiness for himself and great happiness for the citizens" (ὅπως διακοσμηθεὶς τὸ ἦθος εἰς ἀρετὴν λόγῳ, καὶ πρὸς τὸ θειότατον ἀφομοιωθεὶς παράδειγμα τῶν ὄντων καὶ κάλλιστον, ᾧ τὸ πᾶν ἡγουμένῳ πειθόμενον ἐξ ἀκοσμίας κόσμος ἐστί, πολλὴν μὲν εὐδαιμονίαν ἑαυτῷ μηχανήσεται, πολλὴν δὲ τοῖς πολίταις, 10.2–3).

[141] Cf. Plato, *Republic* 4, 443c9–442a2: One achieves a state of justice within one's soul by bringing together all of its parts into a unity, binding them together entirely into one, becoming both moderate and harmonious (πάντα ταῦτα συνδήσαντα καὶ παντάπασιν ἕνα γενόμενον ἐκ πολλῶν, σώφρονα καὶ ἡρμοσμένον, 443e1–2). In so doing, he is putting his own parts in good order, beginning with himself and the three parts of his soul that he arranges, which are dear to himself, and become harmonious with one another (τῷ ὄντι τὰ οἰκεῖα εὖ θέμενον καὶ ἄρξαντα αὐτὸν αὑτοῦ καὶ κοσμήσαντα καὶ φίλον γενόμενον ἑαυτῷ καὶ συναρμόσαντα τρία ὄντα, 443D3–6). After arranging his own soul, he acts in accordance with his just constitution in his practical affairs and his engagement with others (οὕτω δὴ πράττειν ἤδη, 443e2–3). He, in fact, preserves his own constitution and brings it to completion by acting in accordance with his constitution to achieve justice and noble deeds (ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις ἡγούμενον καὶ ὀνομάζοντα δικαίαν μὲν καὶ καλὴν πρᾶξιν, ἣ ἂν ταύτην τὴν ἕξιν σῴζῃ τε καὶ συναπεργάζηται, 443e4–6). Cf also *Republic* 6, 500d5–9, quoted in n. 125 above.

[142] Cf. Bonazzi 2012b, pp. 145–6, for further discussion of this passage: "These are the products of the Academy and this is the legacy a Platonist can go proud of: no matter how wise or well-argued, a philosophical discourse is worthless unless it is able to bring about fitting actions…. Platonism can claim its superiority over other schools: the preeminence of Platonist philosophy is proven through their deeds, and their deeds depend on their philosophy" (p. 146). Cf. also Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft* 798B4–C6, where, quoting *Iliad* 9.443, Plutarch describes the philosopher not only as a speaker of speeches, but also as a doer of deeds, since one could observe that the philosopher's life (φιλοσόφου βίος) is demonstrated in political actions and public struggles (ἐν πράξεσι πολιτικαῖς καὶ δημοσίοις ἀγῶσι), since it is borne out in examples that are accomplished in deed and not merely word (παραδειγμάτων ἔργῳ μὴ λόγῳ περαινομένων). Plutarch is particularly critical of prominent members of the Stoa, naming Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Diogenes, and Antipater, in particular, for being inconsistent between their teaching that one ought to benefit others through engagement as political citizens and their practice of staying out of any meaningful political engagement, living the life of leisured study (σχολαστικὸς βίος, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 1033A1–1034C5). The Epicureans serve as an additional target for lack of useful political activity (*Whether "Live Unknown" is a Wise Precept* 1128A–130E and *Reply to Colotes* 1126C5–1127E7). Cf. Roskam 2004b, p. 245, and Bonazzi 2012b, pp. 141–6. On the overlap between the σχολαστικὸς βίος of the Stoics that Plutarch criticizes, and the βίος θεωρητικός of reason alone, see Plutarch, *Lucullus* 1.6; *Cicero* 3.3. Cf. also Centrone 2000, pp. 576–8, and Bénatouïl 2009.

[143] Plutarch similarly reports that humans endeavor to emulate the divine in terms of incorruption / immortality, power, and virtue (τὸ θεῖον, ᾧ γλίχονται συνοικειοῦν καὶ συναφομοιοῦν ἑαυτούς, τρισὶ δοκεῖ διαφέρειν, ἀφθαρσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει καὶ ἀρετῇ), but that virtue, particularly justice, is the greatest emulation of the divine, is

but instead, by engaging others within one's own life, one can act as a true statesman in seeking the good for oneself and others outside of official political positions (*Whether an Old Man Should Engage in Politics* 796C8–797A4).[144]

In becoming virtuous, moreover, each imitates god *according to their own nature* and particular gifts, not just according to the limitations and conditions of human nature. We are each endowed with different allotments of passions, as though our passionate nature is sown from scattered seeds (*On Tranquility of Mind* 474C1–5),[145] and each is to pursue imitation of the divine as a virtuous individual, given their own kind of life and the passionate nature fitted to it, since the storehouse of goods and evils lies within their own particular soul (473B7–10).[146] These differences are not to be a cause for despair for those who are not born with the potential to become a Plato and write about the nature of reality (472B4–6 and 472D1–10). Just as the

---

the most divine and revered of these qualities (ὧν καὶ σεμνότατον ἡ ἀρετὴ καὶ θειότατόν ἐστιν) and is the only divine good that is within our power (τὴν δ' ἀρετήν, ὃ μόνον ἐστὶ τῶν θείων ἀγαθῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν).

Reydams-Schils (2017, pp. 144–7) argues, *contra* Bonazzi (2012b, pp. 149–50) that human emulation of justice in Plato's *Theaetetus* should be understood as aimed solely at achieving harmony *within the soul*, not toward bringing justice into the world within one's community. For Plutarch, as I hope is clear in this section, emulation of god should be in terms of psychic harmony *and* practical action aimed at bringing justice to one's community through actions for the benefit of others.

[144] On the connection drawn between politics and philosophy in Plutarch see Trapp 2004, pp. 193–8. *Contra* the view of Centrone 2000 (pp. 578–81), Bonazzi 2012b (pp. 151–3) convincingly argues that the political and philosophical lives in Plutarch's view are not merely parallel activities and types of life, but can be collapsed into the same endeavor when understood as aimed at one's own good and the benefit of others; one need not hold a political office to do so. Cf. Plato, *Gorgias* 521d6–522a7: Socrates claims to be perhaps the only true practitioner of the craft of politics, making men better, even though he serves in no official political role as a statesman. On providing political benefit as an advisor to those in rule, see Plutarch *Cicero* 52.4, *Numa* 20.8–9, and *Dion* 1.3. Cf. also Roskam 2002, pp. 175–89, and Bonazzi 2012b, pp. 153–5. Plutarch himself was politically active. On Plutarch's attempts to be politically active as a philosopher see Centrone 2000, pp. 575–6 and Van Hoof 2010, pp. 66–80. See also §II of the Introduction.

[145] "Since our nature receives from birth the seeds of each of these passions mixed together, and for this reason has a great unevenness to it, the man with sense prays for what is better while expecting even the worse, but nevertheless, by removing excess, he makes use of both" (τούτων ἑκάστου σπέρματα τῶν παθῶν ἀνακεκραμένα δεδεγμένης ἡμῶν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πολλὴν ἀνωμαλίαν ἐχούσης, εὔχεται μὲν ὁ νοῦν ἔχων τὰ βελτίονα, προσδοκᾷ δὲ καὶ θάτερα, χρῆται δ' ἀμφοτέροις τὸ ἄγαν ἀφαιρῶν).

[146] "The differences of passions make clear that every individual has the storehouses within himself of contentment and despondency, i.e. the jars of goods and evils, not "stored on the floor of Zeus," [Homer, *Iliad* 24.527] but established within the soul" (ὅτι δ' ἕκαστος ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ τῆς εὐθυμίας καὶ δυσθυμίας ἔχει ταμιεῖα, καὶ τοὺς τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν πίθους οὐκ "ἐν Διὸς οὔδει κατακειμένους" ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ κειμένους αἱ διαφοραὶ τῶν παθῶν δηλοῦσιν).

different deities have precincts of their own, we are to follow the gifts and strengths of our nature as we seek to imitate them and follow in their train (472A11–C5 and 473A7–8; cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 252c3–253c6), which, once again, are largely determined by the kinds of passions and potential strengths of soul with which we are born. The type of life we lead follows from our natural dispositions, as a shoe moves with a foot (*On Tranquility of Mind* 466F2–4).[147] Thus, we are to seek the harmony of virtue within our soul by blending our own particular elements according to our nature (474B1–3[148] and 474C1–5[149]).[150]

So, far from escaping all the passions to become like god, swept away from concern about human foolishness (φλυαρία) to contemplate reality by oneself,[151] human likeness to god is manifest in *moral* virtues and the care for others in the world of here-and-now, in addition to contemplation of the divine. The theoretical life should lead one to live a practical life. As Mauro Bonazzi writes, "In Plutarch, *homoiosis* is never limited to the exercise of mere contemplation, but actually comes to a head through practical activity."[152] Becoming morally virtuous is part of the goal of the theoretical-*cum*-practical life that Plutarch envisions as conjoined, not mutually exclusive, "since the soul is both theoretical and at the same time practical in its nature" (καὶ

[147] "Thus, just as the shoe is twisted together with the foot and not the other way around, so do our dispositions make our lives like themselves" (ὥσπερ οὖν τὸ ὑπόδημα τῷ ποδὶ συνδιαστρέφεται καὶ οὐ τοὐναντίον, οὕτω τοὺς βίους αἱ διαθέσεις συνεξομοιοῦσιν αὑταῖς). Plutarch, I take it, means that the foot drives the shoe this way or that, not that we force the foot to turn with the shoe.
[148] "Like musicians who always dull the worse elements by means of the better ones and encompass the bad with the good, [individuals should] make the mixture of their life harmonious and fitting to themselves" ([δεῖ] ὥσπερ ἁρμονικοὺς ἀμβλύνοντας ἀεὶ τοῖς κρείττοσι τὰ χείρονα καὶ τὰ φαῦλα τοῖς χρηστοῖς ἐμπεριλαμβάνοντας ἐμμελὲς τὸ τοῦ βίου μ(ε)ῖγμα ποιεῖν καὶ οἰκεῖον αὑτοῖς).
[149] See note 145 above.
[150] Cf. Panaetius' four *personae* theory in which our universal rational nature, our own particular nature, our circumstances, and deliberate choice must be taken into consideration to determine what is appropriate (Cicero, *On Duties* 1.107–115). Cf. also Dillon 2010a who analyzes the failures of Dion and Brutus in their efforts to change the ruling regimes of their own times. They fail to take into account circumstances.
[151] *Symposium* 211e2–3; cf. *Phaedo* 62b, 64b–c, 64e–65a, 82d–e, and 115c.
[152] Bonazzi 2012b, p. 150.

μὴν θεωρητικῆς γε τῆς ψυχῆς οὔσης ἅμα καὶ πρακτικῆς, *On the Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus* 1025D11–E1).[153]

Comparing Plutarch's view now with the Stoic end of virtue, Plutarch identifies the end-state of "obeying reason" (τὸ πείθεσθαι λόγῳ) with "following god" (τὸ ἕπεσθαι θεῷ, *On Listening to Lectures* 37D9–E4)[154] and "imitating god" (*On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550A1–10 and C12–E5).[155] Stoics, probably drawing on Platonic sources, also identify the goal of becoming virtuous and "living in conformity with reason"[156] with becoming equal to god in virtue (Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1076A7–8=LS 61J).[157] All of nature seeks to imitate god (*On the Face in the Moon* 944E6–8),[158] but for Plutarch the imitation of god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ)

---

[153] See Bonazzi 2012b, esp. pp. 146–55 and 159. Bonazzi write that "*theoria* leads the way and is fulfilled through *praxis*" (p. 148). In his concluding remarks, Bonazzi also states: "Plutarch essentially rejects the contraposition between active and contemplative life as if they were two separate kinds of life addressing distinct objects and competences: Platonism is the philosophy that is capable of overcoming this false conflict, not by committing itself first to *theoria* and then to *praxis* (the model for mixed life), but by displaying the necessary union that should bind *theoria* and *praxis*."

Alcinous also considers the practical life compatible with the theoretical life, but considers the practical life secondary, though not incompatible with the contemplative life: "From what has been said, it is in no way fitting for a philosopher to abstain from contemplation, but always to nurture it and make it increase, and, following it, to pursue the practical life also" (πρέπει δὴ ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων τῷ φιλοσόφῳ μηδαμῶς τῆς θεωρίας ἀπολείπεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ ταύτην τρέφειν καὶ αὔξειν, ὡς ἑπόμενον δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν πρακτικὸν χωρεῖν βίον, *Handbook* 2.3.5–8). See also Apuleius, *On Plato* 2.23, who also views the contemplative and practical life as compatible, and D.L. 3.78. Eudorus also appears to hold moral virtue to be a key component of the good life and happiness (Stob. 2.7.3f (p. 49, ll. 8–25)). Cf. Sedley 1999, p. 322, n. 19; Annas 1999, p. 59; and Boys-Stones 2014, p. 318.

[154] =[T93] in Chapter 5.

[155] See also Plutarch, *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780E9–F1 and 781A1–7=[T93]; *Dion* 10.1–3 and *Aristides* 6.3–5 above.

[156] Stob. 2.7.5b10 (p. 66, l. 14–p. 67, l.4=LS 61G=*SVF* 3.560); 2.7.6e (p. 77, l.16–27=LS63A=*SVF* 3.16); 2.7.6a (p. 75, l. 11–p. 76, l.8=LS 63B); Galen, *On Hippocrates' and Plato's Doctrines* 4.2.10–18=LS 65J=*SVF* 3.462. Cf. D.L. 7.85–6=LS 57A=*SVF* 3.178.

[157] According to Chrysippus, "Zeus does not exceed Dion in terms of virtue" (ἀρετῇ τε γὰρ οὐχ ὑπερέχειν τὸν Δία τοῦ Δίωνος), reaching his perfection as a rational being in terms of his rational nature (D.L. 7.94). Chrysippus also enjoins us to emulate the "administrator of the whole" (τῶν ὅλων διοικητής, D.L. 7.87–8). He thus "co-opts the end of the *Timaeus*" (Reydams-Schils 2017, p. 148). Reydams-Schils (2017, pp. 148–9 and 156–7) also points to the Stoic quotation that Zeus is the beginning, middle, and fulfillment of all things (Plutarch, *On Common Notions* 1074B) as an appropriation of Plato's *Laws* 4, 715e7–716a2, in addition to the notion that human beings are the imitation (μίμημα) of the divine in Musonius Rufus 17 and l. 4 in Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*. The scholiast to this passage in the *Laws* connects this god with the Demiurge and attributes the idea to the Orphic tradition.

[158] "The desirable, beautiful, divine and blessed [nature that appears in the image of the sun], which all nature in different ways stretches out toward with longing… (τὸ ἐφετὸν καὶ καλὸν καὶ θεῖον καὶ μακάριον, οὗ πᾶσα φύσις, ἄλλη δ' ἄλλως ὀρέγεται…). Cf. Helmig 2005, pp. 21–3. See Carpenter 2010 for an analysis of plants'

and following our rational nature, the τέλος or end-goal of human nature, does not require a renunciation of our passions in this life, but instead involves their incorporation and integration within our human nature. We are to identify with the rational part within ourselves to *guide* and *form* our own desires and passions to be in harmony with reason (Plutarch, *On Isis and Osiris* 378C9–11[159]; *On Moral Virtue* 444C6–D1, 444E9–445A2, 449F2–4; *Platonic Questions* 9, 1008E3–1009B2, 1009A1–B2; *On Moral Progress* 84A5–10; *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance* 550E2–5[160]).

Marrying a theory of identification (οἰκείωσις) through affection (φιλοστοργία) with the goal of becoming like god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ),[161] Plutarch avoids the pitfalls of the Stoic

---

psychic capacities in Plato's *Timaeus* and their derivative sense of desire and stretching toward completion as part of the cosmos. Cf. also Menn 1995, pp. 40–2.

On the Aristotelian active intellect of god in *On the Soul* 3.5 and cosmic emulation of it as final cause see Caston 1999. For Stoic cosmology and its relationship to Aristotle's biological model, particularly the notion that the universe emulates the divine through the agency of the λόγος σπερματικός, see D.L. 7.135–6 and 148–9; Hahm 1977; Horowitz 1998, pp. 26–34. See also Zeller 1892, p. 172.

[159] "For nothing of those things that a human has by nature is more divine than reason, nor do any of these things have a greater influence for happiness" (οὐδὲν γὰρ ὧν ἄνθρωπος ἔχειν πέφυκε θειότερον λόγου καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ περὶ θεῶν, οὐδὲ μείζονα ὁρμὴν ἔχει πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν). Cf. also *ibid*. 351C–D and Ferrari 1995, pp. 18–20.

[160] "For there is no greater benefit that a human naturally derives from god than to become settled in virtue by imitating and pursuing the noble and good qualities in god's nature" (οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ὅ τι μεῖζον ἄνθρωπος ἀπολαύειν θεοῦ πέφυκεν ἢ τὸ μιμήσει καὶ διώξει τῶν ἐν ἐκείνῳ καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν εἰς ἀρετὴν καθίστασθαι).

[161] I argue here that Plutarch unites a version of οἰκείωσις with the Platonic goal of becoming like god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ), even though the latter is often presented as the Platonic alternative to Stoic οἰκείωσις. See Shorey 1929, who draws on the *Anonymous Commentary on Plato's Theaetetus* 7.14–20 on this point. Boys-Stones (2014) also argues that the Platonic foundational theory of ethics is incompatible with the Stoic foundational theory of ethics found in οἰκείωσις, because, for a Platonist, one could never derive the *concept of the good* from the Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις, which can only be found through the Form of the Good. According to Boys-Stones, this theory could be accepted by Platonists for animal behavior, but not for the formation of human virtue (cf. Boys-Stones 2017, p. 462). See also Reydams-Schils 2017, for similar sentiments. For Plutarch, his version of οἰκείωσις and the Platonic goal of becoming like god are not mutually exclusive, since he does not take οἰκείωσις as describing the entire foundation of ethics, but instead as the starting-point and seeds, as it were, of our social lives and justice.

As Boys-Stones notes (2014, pp. 300–1, n. 7), Philo of Alexandria attempts to identify a form of οἰκείωσις with the Platonic goal of assimilation to the divine, contrasting this οἰκείωσις with another that aims at the care for the body (*On the Descendants of Cain* 12.2–7; 135.4–6; 157.1–4 and *On the Giants* 29.1–2). Although Philo's view bears some similarity with Plutarch's, since he writes that for humans to receive their fitting end, a strong love must be present (εἰ μὴ προσγένοιτο σφοδρὸς ἔρως…δίχα μὲν οἰκειώσεως τῆς πρὸς αὐτὰ τὸ ἁρμόττον τέλος οὐ λαμβάνει, 157.1–4), Philo describes οἰκείωσις as providing "seeds of thought" (τὰ φρονήσεως σπέρματα, *On the Descendants of Cain* 135.4–6), unlike the passionate seeds of justice that lie at the beginning of Plutarch's account of οἰκείωσις.

Some have thought that Polemo laid the groundwork for a Platonic form of οἰκείωσις or prefigured the theory as structured by Zeno (*institutio veterum, quo etiam Stoici utuntur*, Cicero, *On Ends* 5.23, for which, see Dillon 2003,

theory of οἰκείωσις, which, as I argued in Chapter 1, he sees as *alienating* us from our own care and concern for others and our own passionate desires. He dodges the Charybdis, as it were, of Stoic personal virtue that Plutarch believes to be too inward-focused, spiraling too much into concern for the preservation of one's own constitution through appropriate actions, since our social lives begin with passion. At the same time, he also avoids the Scylla, as it were, of Platonic renunciation of the active life, moral virtues, and the passions.

***

In coming to the end of this final chapter, we revisited the first. I began Chapter 1 with Plutarch's criticisms of the Stoic ideal life and its development from their theory of οἰκείωσις. We ended with Plutarch's own form of οἰκείωσις and the end-goal of becoming like god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ). We found that Plutarch, far from slavishly copying his predecessors or collecting their views together into a contradictory amalgam of philosophical principles, adapts and modifies these views to fit within his own philosophical view. Together with pregnant metaphors, Plutarch presents his own view in which passions play an important and positive role from our nascent desire and initial impulses toward virtue through to the culmination of human nature. In contrast with the austere requirements of becoming free from passions in the Stoic ideal or leaving this world behind together with our human nature to become a creature of pure contemplation, Plutarch presents an attractive alternative kind of life. Plutarch preserves the best parts of our passionate nature, highlights their importance for moral progress, and incorporates them into the good life. He develops a form of passionate Platonism.

---

pp. 162–5). See the quotation of Polemo in *To an Uneducated Ruler* 780D3–7 (quoted in n. 136 above). The evidence for a fully-fledged Platonic form of οἰκείωσις attributable to Polemo, however, is unsubstantiated and speculative at best. Cf. Tarrant 2012, pp. 158–62 and n. 17; Renaud and Tarrant 2015, pp. 109–10.

On Antiochus' version of οἰκείωσις, described in Cicero, *On Ends* 5, and its similarities and differences from the earlier Stoic versions and later Peripatetic versions, see Görgemanns 1983 and Gill 2016, pp. 221–47.

CONCLUSION

In contrast with his contemporaries and predecessors, Plutarch comes across as surprisingly modern in his sentiments and sensitivities. He speaks to our common intuitions on the many good aspects of human emotion. In this dissertation, I have demonstrated how Plutarch constructs and presents his own vision of human nature, moral progress, and the good life, and how in each stage of our existence, passions play essential, important, and positive roles. In the first chapter, we saw that Plutarch defends the vulnerability we experience in our passions because vulnerability and emotions are not only a natural feature of human nature, but they also make possible many good features of life, including the goods of friendship. Passions provide the glue, as it were, that bonds us together, and we cannot form deep and meaningful relationships with others unless we are emotionally vulnerable with them.

This took us into Plutarch's criticism of the Stoic theory of appropriation and identification (οἰκείωσις), which the Stoics claim is foundational for all human relationships, human virtue, and human fulfillment. Plutarch, we saw, rejects this theory because it leads to an impossible and inhuman ideal. If we are to pursue the Stoic ideal, we must attempt to deaden our passionate nature so that we are no longer vulnerable to pain and are unaffected by what is outside our control. The Stoic theory of appropriation and identification led ironically to alienation from human nature and interpersonal relationships. Instead of leading to the

fulfillment of human nature, it also led to its mutilation. This, I took to be a foil for Plutarch's own view that our social lives begin with passion and continue to incorporate and develop passions throughout life, up to Plutarch's own ideal of a morally virtuous life, which I discussed in the final chapter.

In the second chapter, we found that Plutarch's defense of passions, and grief in particular, seemed to be at odds with much of what is said about passions in Plato's dialogues. In the *Republic*, we are advised to suppress grief as far as possible, since the virtuous person will be most self-sufficient and least affected by circumstances, even by the loss of friends and family. Passions such as grief, the *Republic* tells us, serve no useful purpose, and the entertainment of grief is a form of fruitless indulgence. Plutarch, however, holds that grief is natural and can even be useful in helping us to form close relationships with others and in helping us to influence one another to good ends. More generally, we found that Plutarch defends passions as necessary aspects of our nature that contribute positively to life; they are teleologically oriented to specific, useful purposes.

In the second chapter, I also argued that Plutarch draws upon certain passages in Plato's dialogues, which are more positive in their evaluation of emotions, to speak against other passages that appear to set the ideal of human life as essentially rational and free of the influence of passions, which often appear to be pollutions of the soul and necessary evils due to embodiment. Plutarch's own conception of virtue requires that passions be moderate, going neither to excess nor deficiency; we must have the right amount of passion to be virtuous individuals. In formulating this view, Plutarch uses the metaphor of musical harmony and of the harmonious blending of humors within the body, which he draws from Plato's dialogues, but he mixes this metaphor with the doctrine of the mean, which appears to be of Aristotelian

provenance. Though Plutarch is much indebted to Aristotle in his description of moral virtue as a mean state of passions, he would not see himself as parroting an Aristotelian view of ethics set against Platonic ethics or philosophy. He adapts Aristotelian ideas together with Platonic images, because he conceives of the Platonic Academy as a unified tradition from Socrates to himself, including Aristotle. Plutarch believes that this tradition aims above all else at discovering truth through philosophical investigation and not at securing dogmatic allegiance. Plato and his followers, including Aristotle, provide the best explanations and theories to date, but their views are subject to reevaluation and further exploration, since one's theory must align with truth rather than received doctrine. My second chapter thus helped set the stage for the chapters that followed by framing Plutarch's adaptations of ideas and arguments from Plato's dialogues, Aristotle's works, and the views of later Academics.

In the third chapter, I explored Plutarch's arguments that passions are not only necessary for practical action, but also enhance our lives. Passions are the Wind in Our Sails. They can be useful aids in providing motivation and in inciting a desire for moral progress as well as in fortifying our resolve to continue to strive for virtue and the good life in the face of difficulties. Plutarch argues that we not only could not do without passions, but we would not, since passions make life better.

The fourth chapter explored the cognitive aspect of certain spirited emotions such as anger, shame, and the desire for honor. As we saw there, the spirited part of the soul has a greater capacity to align itself with noble pursuits and with the good life as opposed to the appetitive part of the soul. It also has a capacity to help regulate desires within the soul, which is revealed in periods of life when spirited emotions restrain illicit desires independently of the rational part of the soul. Spirited passions are able to do this because they can be shaped to retain certain

standards of judgment about what is honorable and what is shameful. They can thereafter help suppress errant desires according to these standards.

These capacities become all important for Plutarch's view on early childhood education, which we explored in the fifth chapter. Before the advent of reason in children, their passionate nature is shaped and molded as a form of preparation for virtuous character. In contrast with his Academic predecessor, Xenocrates, who calls education in mathematics, astronomy, and music the grips of philosophy, Plutarch holds the passions of the spirited part of the soul to be the place where virtue and philosophy get their first grip on one's character. For Plutarch, early education of our passionate nature begins before our rational powers are developed. It involves the inculcation of beliefs about what types of actions are suitable or not, honorable or shameful. It also largely determines how well we will be able to develop our character into a virtuous character later in life, since it will be hard to bring our passions into alignment with sound reasoning about what is good, honorable, and virtuous later in life, if our desires and values are greatly skewed in our upbringing. We also saw that spirited emotions, according to Plutarch, must be anchored to correct reasoning through philosophy so that we are not manipulated by chance praise or blame.

In the final chapter, we saw that passions play an important role in human nature from beginning to end for Plutarch. A capacity to identify with others and form just relations with other human beings grows from the seeds of our passionate nature. We also saw that for Plutarch these passions must be cultivated to bear the fruit of virtue. Passions provide the starting-point for human virtue, like seeds, but they are not sufficient to bring us to the fulfillment in virtue without good upbringing and skillful promotion of good aspects of our nature and the suppression and removal of the bad. By planting the seeds of virtue and human sociability in our

passionate nature, Plutarch provides an alternative account of human identification that contrasts sharply with the Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις. The beginning of our social lives and the virtues of human nature grow from our passions.

We cannot perfect our human nature through the growth of these passions without reason, but neither do we dispense with our passions as we mature and seek the fulfillment of our nature. Plutarch joins his own view of identification to the Platonic goal of becoming like god (ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ). We reach the end-goal of human nature in becoming like god, a common Platonic goal, but we do so with the whole of our human nature, which includes our passions. While some Platonists hold that we must leave moral virtue and the passions behind to become like god, seeking a life divorced from practical action enrapt in pure contemplation, Plutarch argues that we become like god while remaining fully human. The most divine attributes we emulate aim at benefitting others, like a divine ruler, but we cultivate these dispositions and virtues with other-regarding passions. The purpose of philosophy is to make those who become like god active agents in this world (*Philosophers and Men in Power* 776C8–D3).

From this perspective we saw that passions for Plutarch are integral to human nature from life's inception to its fulfillment. Passions help us begin the process of becoming fully human, they spur us on in the process of becoming virtuous, and they continue to be a part of our perfected nature. The good life that Plutarch describes is a very human life. It includes intimacy in human relationships, the joys and pleasures of human experience, and seeks to make this life the best that it can be not only for ourselves, but for those around us.

After surveying and exploring a number of different texts in the preceding chapters, I hope it is now apparent, if not before, that passions are central to Plutarch's philosophy and to his philosophical *project*. Throughout the *Moralia* and the *Lives*, Plutarch presents passions as

important to moral progress and as parts of the good life. If we follow this thread, we find that it unifies Plutarch's overall project and reveals a distinctive kind of life as the human ideal. That life aims at cultivating the right kinds of passions into a morally virtuous life.

This kind of life is accessible. We need not abandon society to live in a garden, nor must we become something other than human, dulling our sensitivities and extirpating our emotions to become invulnerable and perfectly rational. The best kind of life we should pursue here and now is an entirely human life. It is not completely alien to our intuitions about what makes life pleasant and good, which includes good emotions. It is the fulfillment of our desire to be in community with intimate and rewarding relationships while also fulfilling our own purpose in becoming the right kind of people. This kind of life takes into account natural differences among individuals, so that not everyone must aspire to be the next Plato, but it sets as a common goal the development of benevolent dispositions that aim at improving not only our own lives but those of others around us. This life is not apolitical, but neither does it advocate that everyone aim at holding political offices. As Socrates argues in Plato's *Gorgias*, the true politician is the one who seeks to make others better (521d6–522a7).

Plutarch's philosophy is also accessible. Plutarch's vision of the good life and the path we take to it permeates and informs his writings and reaches an audience that extends beyond his own philosophical circle and the schools that he engages with in debate. Plutarch makes his philosophical views available through a variety of different genres, in dialogues, letters, diatribes, and biographies. He uses different modes and methods to convey his message. He gives advice to friends and admirers and publishes polemical arguments against his opponents. In places he provides interpretive commentary to Plato's dialogues, to the works of Aristotle, and to the writings and sayings of previous Academic figures. He also presents his own mythical

representations. He speaks to us through many voices, including those of his teachers, friends, mythical characters, and even in his own person and literary *persona*.

Plutarch's philosophical project has been successful. Even if his *Moralia* have often been neglected, Plutarch's biographies have spoken to generations. Even if over the last two centuries Plutarch's philosophy in the *Moralia* was thought to be inconsistent or second-rate, his vision of the good life has nevertheless reached the readers of his *Lives*. Now it is time for Plutarch's *Moralia* and his philosophical views to be appreciated not only for their part in underpinning his project in the *Lives* and deepening our understanding of Plutarch's overall project, but also as a contribution in the enduring philosophical debate on the best kind of life.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER 4

Plato and Spirited Evaluation: A Background

In §III of Chapter 4, I merely summarize the findings of the analysis that follows in this appendix. I repeat these points here for the reader's convenience. In Plato's dialogues, there is some ambiguity in the attribution of evaluative beliefs to the spirited passions, the non-rational spirited part of the soul, and the person as a whole. This obfuscates the extent to which we can understand the cognitive capacities of the spirited part of the soul and what role it plays in evaluating actions that it comes to oppose as inappropriate (§A.I.). A passage in *Republic* 10 argues that different parts of the soul must be at work when two contrary *beliefs* are held at the same time, in the same respect, etc. The parts of the soul that hold beliefs in contrast with reason appear to fit the profile of the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul (§A.II.). Yet belief attribution to the non-rational parts of the soul appears to be problematic, given the definition of belief in Plato's other works, namely the *Sophist*, *Theaetetus*, *Timaeus* and *Philebus*, where rational thought seems necessary for the formation of beliefs and for access to the contents of beliefs formulated as propositional statements (§A.III.).

Passages in Plato's *Philebus*, with possible parallels in the *Timaeus*, seem to indicate that all beliefs are formulated as propositional statements before this information is related to the non-rational parts of the soul. Even sense-perceptible information is filtered through the rational part of the soul before reaching the appetitive and spirited parts of the soul. For the appetitive part of the soul, an inner painter draws representations of the propositional statements,

and in the *Timaeus* the liver reflects statements as images or phantoms, since the appetitive part of the soul is incapable of understanding propositional statements. The spirited part of the soul has some capacity to understand the beliefs presented to it by the rational part, but belief-formation occurs within the rational part of the soul, which structures all the information that reaches the lower parts of the soul. Information flows from the top, through reason, down to the non-rational parts of the soul (§A.IV.). In contrast with the top-down view presented in the *Philebus*, there are a few hints elsewhere in Plato's dialogues that the spirited part of the soul can form beliefs independently of reason. In the *Timaeus*, there is also a hint that the non-rational parts of the soul may have a direct connection to sense-perception without sense-perceptible information going through the rational part of the soul first (§A.V.)

§A.I. Plato and the Spirited Evaluation of Action

Beginning with the analysis of spirited emotions in Plato's *Republic* 4, after Socrates distinguishes the rational part of the soul (τὸ λογιστικόν) from its appetitive part (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν), Socrates gives the example of Leontius, who feels disgust toward his own shameful desire to pursue a shameful act *because* he considers the act and his desire to pursue it shameful, to draw a distinction between this third, non-rational spirited part of the soul and its non-rational appetitive part.[1] In the example that Socrates provides, Leontius feels a strong desire

[1]Although some authors consider the conflict between the spirited part of the soul and appetitive part to be a second-order desire *not to have the appetitive desire* (see, e.g. Irwin 1977, p. 327; *id*. 1995, pp. 207–17; Price 1995, pp. 47–8; Cooper 1999b, p. 123), I (along with Bobonich 2002, pp. 248–52; Moss 2005, p. 153; Lorenz 2006, pp. 16–17, 45–6; and Erginel (forthcoming), pp. 16–17) do not think that that account can succeed in the context of the argument for partition. Two contrary first-order desires are needed for the argument of partition to succeed, since critical conflict requires that the opposites be directed toward the same object, in the same respect, etc. If the spirited part has a second-order desire, its object will be not to have the desire to do what is shameful *vel sim*., which is not a contrary force to the same object (the activity of looking at dead bodies in this case). I take it that the spirited part of the soul can have a representation of the appetitive desire as shameful that *leads to* a desire not to pursue that action. The evaluation is explanatory for why the spirited part of the soul opposes the appetitive desire, but it is the contravening desire that it initiates, namely, the desire not to look at the dead bodies, that directly opposes the appetitive desire.

to gaze upon corpses as he walks through a field. Against this desire, which belongs to the appetitive part of his soul (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν), Leontius feels disgust (δυσχεραίνειν) and anger (θυμοῦσθαι, *Republic* 4, 439e8–440b7), passions that belong to and issue from the spirited part of the soul (*Republic* 4, 439e1–3). In a moment of sarcastic self-rebuke, he chastises his desire, directed toward his eyes as the instrument through which the desire attempts to take satisfaction, "Take your fill of that *noble* sight, you damn wretches!" (ὦ κακοδαίμονες, ἐμπλήσθητε τοῦ καλοῦ θεάματος, 4, 440a4). Through this sarcastic rebuke, Leontius indicates the shame he imputes to the *act* and the shame he feels in having the *desire* that led to his indulgence in gazing at cadavers: his appetitive desire to look upon the corpses is shameful.[2]

So far, it is not apparent through which part of the soul Leontius comes to evaluate the action that is pursued by his appetitive desire and the desire itself as shameful. On the one hand, Glaucon gleans from the story that the spirited emotion of anger is what is arrayed against, and opposed to, the desires of the appetitive part of the soul:

[A1] ὁ λόγος σημαίνει τὴν ὀργὴν πολεμεῖν ἐνίοτε ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ὡς ἄλλο ὂν ἄλλῳ.

> The story indicates that anger sometimes makes war against the desires, as one thing against a different one. (Plato, *Republic* 4, 440a6–7)

The attribution of agency in *restraining* and *opposing* appetitive desire falls squarely on the passion of anger in this passage. Thus far, we have the psychic activity of the spirited part, i.e. anger, opposed to the appetitive part's activity, i.e. appetite, as one thing against another (ὡς ἄλλο ὂν ἄλλῳ).

On the other hand, just after [A1] Socrates attributes the reason for feeling disgust and anger to a sense of shame that "someone" (τις) feels who *believes* an action has unjustly been

[2] See Moss 2005, p. 153: "This is straight irony: the sight is not *kalon*, but the very opposite—*aischron*, ugly and shameful."

performed by himself (τις οἴηται ἀδικεῖν, 440b9) or against him (ἀδικεῖσθαι τις ἡγῆται, 440c6). The belief (οἴεσθαι, ἡγεῖσθαι) is attributed to the person, i.e. the someone (τις), not explicitly the spirited part of the soul. This someone (τις) appears to be the individual or person who has a *sense* that he has committed or suffered an injustice and thereafter experiences the spirited emotions of shame, anger, and disgust (440b9–d3). So, while in [A1] it is the spirited passion of anger (ὀργή) that opposes desires of another part of the soul, namely, the appetitive part, it also seems that it is the person indicated by "someone" (τις) who *senses* the war within himself and evaluates what has happened and, as a result of that evaluation, experiences the spirited emotions of disgust and anger:

[A2] οὐκοῦν…πολλαχοῦ αἰσθανόμεθα, ὅταν βιάζωνταί τινα παρὰ τὸν λογισμὸν ἐπιθυμίαι, λοιδοροῦντά τε αὐτὸν καὶ θυμούμενον τῷ βιαζομένῳ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὥσπερ δυοῖν στασιαζόντοιν σύμμαχον τῷ λόγῳ γιγνόμενον τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ τοιούτου;

> Do we not often perceive, whenever desires force someone contrary to his reasoning, that he [that someone] both rebukes himself and gets angry with the part within himself that is compelling him, and, as though two factions in a civil war are fighting one another, do we not perceive that the spirited passion of someone like that becomes an ally to his reason? (Plato, *Republic* 4, 440a9–b4)

In [A2] we seem to be moving between an individual subject, the someone (τις) not directly identified with one part of the soul, and spirited passion (ὁ θυμός) in the explanation of psychic conflict. Someone (τις) rebukes himself (αὐτόν) and grows angry with the part of his soul *within himself* (ἐν αὐτῷ) responsible for coercing him into a shameful action, namely, the appetitive part of the soul, due to an *evaluation* of his desires, a belief-state attributed to the person (τις).

If we were to stop there, it would look as though attribution of spirited anger (θυμοῦσθαι) that opposes the shameful desire falls solely to the person as a whole, not to a particular part of his soul, especially considering that the subject of the participle, "gets angry with" (θυμούμενον) is the someone (τινα), the overall person, in this sentence. When we move

to the next clause, however, we find that it is spirited passion itself (ὁ θυμός) which opposes the appetitive desire, becoming an ally (σύμμαχον) with reason.

Emphasis on the passion itself points to the soul-part responsible for that passion as the agent responsible for that activity, since it is the opposition of these passions in [A2], that leads Socrates to conclude together with Glaucon that the spirited part of the soul (τὸ θυμοειδές) is different from the appetitive part of the soul due to the Principle of Opposites. The spirited emotion of anger (ὀργή / θυμός) that opposes desires in [A1] and [A2] belongs to the spirited part of the soul (τὸ θυμοειδές):

[A3] οὕτως καὶ ἐν ψυχῇ τρίτον τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ θυμοειδές, ἐπίκουρον ὂν τῷ λογιστικῷ φύσει.

In this way, the spirited part is a third part within the soul, being a natural ally to the rational part. (Plato, *Republic* 4, 441a2–3)

The conclusion in [A3] reveals that Socrates' description of the passion that allies itself with reason in [A2] can be spelled out as the spirited part of the soul (τὸ θυμοειδές) opposing appetitive desire because it is a natural ally to the rational part of the soul (τὸ λογιστικόν), as one thing set against another (ὡς ἄλλο ὂν ἄλλῳ, 440a6–7 in [A1]). Socrates' remarks that the spirited passion becomes the ally with reason in [A1] is not just a way of expressing a passion that someone (τις) has toward the appetitive desire to look at dead bodies. The passionate part of the soul is responsible for the contravening psychic activity as the subject of that activity. But it also indicates that the emotion in question is also representative of the non-rational part of the soul from which it issues as well (*Republic* 4, 439e1–3). If it did not, the flow of the argument for partition between the spirited part of the soul (τὸ θυμοειδές) and the appetitive part of the soul (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν) would not succeed, as Socrates and Glaucon claim it does in [A3].

The ambiguity between the person (τις) and part of the soul could still indicate that both

the evaluation and the psychic activity of anger truly, or more accurately, belongs to the part of the soul, even if we speak loosely in attributing it to the person. First, consider the initial characterizations of the different parts of the soul. Each part is described by an instrumental dative locution. The rational part, to which calculation belongs as its activity is "that with which [the soul] calculates" (ᾧ λογίζεται, 4, 439d5). The appetitive part is "that with which it experiences sexual desire, hunger, thirst, and grows excited over other desires" (ᾧ ἐρᾷ τε καὶ πεινῇ καὶ διψῇ καὶ περὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἐπιθυμίας ἐπτόηται, 4, 439d6–7). Finally, the spirited part is "that with which we grow angry" (ᾧ θυμούμεθα, 4, 439e2). So, perhaps we should not be surprised to find that in this passage the part with which one experiences or activates opposing motivations is often described instrumentally, as though the person as a whole is experiencing conflicting forces through these different parts of the soul.

Secondly, Socrates makes the point that we can speak loosely or strictly in terms of the subjects of activity. The example of the archer who is both pushing and pulling on the bow is a prime example (*Republic* 4, 439b8–c1). The soul as a whole has conflicting forces and is at war with itself, but more strictly speaking, we should say that one part of the soul is the subject of an activity that is opposed to the activity of another part of the soul (4, 436b9–d2), just as one part of the archer, the first hand, pushes on the bow while another part, the second hand, pulls (ἄλλη μὲν ἡ ἀπωθοῦσα χείρ, ἑτέρα δὲ ἡ προσαγομένη, *Republic* 4, 439b10–c1).[3]

[3] Cf. Aristotle, *On the Soul* 1.4, 408b11–15: "And to say that the soul is angry is as if one should say that the soul weaves or builds houses. For it is perhaps better not to say that the soul pities, learns, or thinks, but instead to say that the human individual does these things with the soul" (τὸ δὴ λέγειν ὀργίζεσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν ὅμοιον κἂν εἴ τις λέγοι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑφαίνειν ἢ οἰκοδομεῖν· βέλτιον γὰρ ἴσως μὴ λέγειν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐλεεῖν ἢ μανθάνειν ἢ διανοεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῇ ψυχῇ). Interestingly, Aristotle considers it more proper to attribute the action to the person as a whole. He also construes the soul as instrumental to the activities in question. Aristotle does not explicitly describe the soul as the instrument (ὄργανον) that the human individual uses (χρῆσθαι), as he does in describing the soul's use of the body in *On the Soul* 1.3, 407b25–6, where the soul's use of the body is likened to a craft's use of tools (δεῖ γὰρ τὴν μὲν τέχνην χρῆσθαι τοῖς ὀργάνοις, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν τῷ σώματι). Nevertheless, the soul in 408b11–15 is expressed by an instrumental dative, much as each part of the soul is characterized by an instrumental dative. While in *Republic* 4 the opposing activities belong to the different parts of the soul, described

Thirdly, in the Leontius example, the ambiguity between the person and part of the soul also occurs with respect to appetite: Leontius struggles with himself and is disgusted with *himself*, since *he* has an appetitive desire to look at the corpses:

[A4] ἅμα μὲν ἰδεῖν ἐπιθυμοῖ, ἅμα δὲ αὖ δυσχεραίνοι καὶ ἀποτρέποι ἑαυτόν.

> At the same time he desires to look but also feels disgusted with himself and turns himself away. (*Republic* 4, 439e8–440a1)

Although the appetitive desire here is attributed to the person, since *he* has the desire, we find that the desire more strictly belongs to the appetitive part of the soul; otherwise the argument that the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul are distinct would not succeed. Given these moves between loosely attributing activities to the person and more strictly attributing them to parts of the soul, it is possible that the attribution of an evaluation to the person as a whole could still more strictly speaking belong to the spirited part of the soul.

More could be pressed out of these passages from Plato's *Republic* on the topic of soul-part agency and personal agency in Platonic psychology, but it is outside the scope of this discussion to explore that topic satisfactorily.[4] My purpose here is to emphasize the ambiguity in ascribing evaluation and agency to passion, a part of the soul, and the person as a whole, especially in terms of *how* one comes to evaluate an action as shameful or honorable, inappropriate or appropriate. So far, it appears that while the *force* of opposition belongs to the spirited part of the soul and is instantiated as the non-rational passions of anger, disgust and shame, the evaluation of the desire as shameful could still be taking place *outside* of the spirited part of the soul. In the Leontius passage, the representation of desires and actions *as* shameful so

---

instrumentally, Aristotle argues that different activities of the soul should be understood in terms of the origin and termination of movement or activity in the soul, not as parts used as instruments: "This is not to say that the movement / activity is in the soul, but that sometimes it ends in it, while at other times it comes from it" (τοῦτο δὲ μὴ ὡς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῆς κινήσεως οὔσης, ἀλλ' ὁτὲ μὲν μέχρι ἐκείνης, ὁτὲ δ' ἀπ' ἐκείνης, 1.4, 408b15–16).

[4] See Chapter 4, n. 38.

far is attributed only to the person (τις) evaluating actions. It could be that the rational part of the soul holds this view of appetitive desire as shameful and leads the spirited part of the soul to oppose it.

If the evaluation of the appetite is indeed outside the spirited part of the soul, the argument for division between the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul still succeeds. All that is needed to separate the spirited part of the soul from the appetitive in *Republic* 4 is for one internal psychic force to be set against another, which we find in the Leontius example. The appetitive desire to gaze at cadavers is opposed by spirited anger. The opposed pro-attitudinal desire of the appetitive part and con-attitudinal anger of the spirited part are sufficient to establish that the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul are different from one another and fit with the examples of opposites that Socrates outlines in laying out the Principle of Opposites:

[A5] τὸ ἐπινεύειν τῷ ἀνανεύειν καὶ τὸ ἐφίεσθαί τινος λαβεῖν τῷ ἀπαρνεῖσθαι καὶ τὸ προσάγεσθαι τῷ ἀπωθεῖσθαι, πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ἐναντίων ἀλλήλοις… εἴτε ποιημάτων εἴτε παθημάτων.

> approving and disapproving, being eager to take something and refusing it, taking something and pushing it away, all things of this sort are opposites to one another…whether they are actions or passive experiences. (Plato, *Republic* 4, 437b1–4)

Along with this list, Socrates and Glaucon also include desires, willing, and wishing and their opposites as pro- and con-attitudinal states that, when they occur simultaneously with regard to the same object, in the same way, etc., require that these states belong to separate subjects through the Principle of Opposites (437b6–7).

§A.II. Evaluations and Beliefs of the Non-Rational Parts of Soul in Plato

In *Republic* 10, the list of opposites grows to include holding contrary *appearances* and *beliefs* about the same subject, at the same time, etc.:

[A6] τούτῳ δὲ πολλάκις μετρήσαντι καὶ σημαίνοντι μείζω ἄττα εἶναι ἢ ἐλάττω ἕτερα

ἑτέρων ἢ ἴσα τἀναντία φαίνεται ἅμα περὶ ταὐτά.
 ναί.
οὐκοῦν ἔφαμεν τῷ αὐτῷ ἅμα περὶ ταὐτὰ ἐναντία δοξάζειν ἀδύνατον εἶναι;
 καὶ ὀρθῶς γ' ἔφαμεν.
τὸ παρὰ τὰ μέτρα ἄρα δοξάζον τῆς ψυχῆς τῷ κατὰ τὰ μέτρα οὐκ ἂν εἴη ταὐτόν.
 οὐ γὰρ οὖν.
ἀλλὰ μὴν τὸ μέτρῳ γε καὶ λογισμῷ πιστεῦον βέλτιστον ἂν εἴη τῆς ψυχῆς.
 Τί μήν;
Τὸ ἄρα τούτῳ ἐναντιούμενον τῶν φαύλων ἄν τι εἴη ἐν ἡμῖν.
 Ἀνάγκη.

Often, when this part of the soul [namely, the rational part whose function is reasoning (τοῦ λογιστικοῦ ἔργον, 601e1–2)] has measured and indicates certain objects to be larger, smaller, or equal to others, contrary representations appear at the same time about the same things.
 Yes.
Surely then we said that it is not possible for the same thing to hold contrary beliefs[5] at the same time about the same things, right [because of the Principle of Opposites]?
 We rightly did say that.
The part of the soul that holds to a belief contrary to measurement would not be the same as the part [that holds to a belief] according to measurement.
 No, certainly not.
Yet truly the part that trusts in measure and calculation would be the best part of the soul.
 Well, yes, surely.
Then what opposes this would be something belonging to the inferior parts within us?
 Necessarily so.

(*Republic* 10, 602e4–603a8)[6]

So, in addition to the exhortative and volitional pro- and con-attitudes listed in *Republic* 4,

belief-states whose content is contrary and concerned with the same objects, in the same way, at

[5] I have chosen to leave it unclear whether the non-rational parts of the soul can *form* beliefs in addition to *entertaining* or *having* beliefs in my translation of δοξάζειν here. As will become clearer below in my analysis of Plato's psychology, and, as I have tried to show in Chapter 4 for Plutarch's psychology, there is an important distinction to be made between *having* a belief and *forming* a belief. In my translation of this passage I also try to preserve the connection between having things seem a certain way or having a representation (φαίνεται), since I take it that the shift from the formulation of "contrary representations appear at the same time about the same things" (τἀναντία φαίνεται ἅμα περὶ ταὐτά) to "to hold contrary beliefs at the same time about the same things" (ἅμα περὶ ταὐτὰ ἐναντία δοξάζειν) requires that the formulations be interchangeable in meaning in order for the argument in [A6] to work. This also is in accord with the connection made between representation (φαντασία, φαίνεσθαι) and belief in *Sophist* 264b1–2: "What we mean when we say 'It seems' is a mixture of perception and belief" ("φαίνεται" δὲ ὃ λέγομεν σύμμειξις αἰσθήσεως καὶ δόξης=[A7] below). See also Singpurwalla 2010, pp. 885–6, who is careful to distinguish reasoned *judgments* that belong to the rational part of the soul from the *appearances* that the non-rational parts of the soul are capable of having as beliefs. I address this distinction below.
[6] Cf. Lycos 1964, pp. 498–500.

the same time, etc., is also sufficient to distinguish two different subjects that have the contrary beliefs.[7]

More importantly for our purposes of discovering *how* the spirited part of the soul has a representation of actions as honorable or shameful, appropriate or inappropriate, it seems from what we learn in [A6] that the non-rational spirited part of the soul is indeed capable of *having* an evaluation of actions on its own, since it has a representation (φαντασία), or things seem a certain way to it (φαίνεσθαι), and it holds to a belief (δοξάζειν / δόξα) in contrast to the rational part of the soul's evaluative representation and belief.[8] Attribution of representation and belief also seem to apply to the non-rational appetitive part, since the non-rational passionate part of the soul under discussion here in *Republic* 10 covers both the appetitive and spirited parts of the soul, characterized by both sexual desire (belonging to the appetitive part) and anger (belonging to the spirited part, *Republic* 10, 606d1–7).[9]

---

[7] Cf. Singpurwalla 2010, p. 887. Along with Lorenz 2006, pp. 60–73, I take it that *Republic* 10 is intended to be read together with the arguments for a tripartite soul-division in *Republic* 4. Socrates asks Glaucon whether a person is experiencing psychic conflict in cases such as the one described in *Republic* 10, 602e4–603a8=[A6], and, instead of going through a detailed argument, says, "I recall that we do not need to come to an agreement on this point now, since in our arguments before we sufficiently came to agreement on all these things, namely that our soul is full of a myriad of oppositions like these that occur at the same time" (ἀναμιμνήσκομαι δὲ ὅτι τοῦτό γε νῦν οὐδὲν δεῖ ἡμᾶς διομολογεῖσθαι· ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἄνω λόγοις ἱκανῶς πάντα ταῦτα διωμολογησάμεθα, ὅτι μυρίων τοιούτων ἐναντιωμάτων ἅμα γιγνομένων ἡ ψυχὴ γέμει ἡμῶν, *Republic* 10, 603d3–6). I take it that Socrates is referring to the argument for partition according the Principle of Opposites in *Republic* 4. For dissenting views that take *Republic* 10 to describe a division of belief between two rational parts see Nehamas 1982, pp. 65–6; Price 1995, p. 44; Burnyeat 1999, pp. 223–6; Sedley 2004, p. 113.

[8] The attribution of "belief" / "appearance" (δόξα / φαντασία) should not be taken as always false vis-à-vis the cognitive state of calculated belief and the success-term of "knowledge" (ἐπιστήμη). In the *Republic*, appearance / representation (φαντασία, φαίνεσθαι) can be used to describe true representations as well as false; cf. Stavru 2017, pp. 1–7.

[9] Against Nehamas (1982, p. 66), who believes that *Republic* 10 must be describing two different rational parts, one superior and another inferior, Lorenz (2006, p. 66, n. 17) convincingly argues that it would seem odd for Socrates to refer to the rational part of the soul within us as far from wisdom (πόρρω δ' αὖ φρονήσεως ὄντι τῷ ἐν ἡμῖν, 10, 603b1–2) and the foolish part of the soul (τῷ ἀνοήτῳ αὐτῆς, 605b7), even if there were an inferior rational part of the soul in addition to a superior one. Together with this line of argument, I would add, drawing on the previous note, that Socrates closely aligns the argument for different parts of the soul in *Republic* 10 to the argument for different parts of the soul in *Republic* 4, which distinguished the rational part from the non-rational parts of the soul. Additionally, as I note above, the inferior parts of the soul are later characterized in *Republic* 10 by the desires belonging to the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul, not to the rational part of the soul.

Returning now to the example of Leontius in *Republic* 4, the opposites that Socrates and Glaucon recognize as necessitating a division between the appetitive and spirited parts of the soul are pro- and con-attitudinal: a desire to look at cadavers and a contrary motivation not to look at them. The discussion of opposing beliefs in [A6], while not necessary to establish the differentiation of spirited emotion from appetitive desire in Leontius' case, nonetheless opens up the possibility that the evaluative aspect of Leontius' spirited emotion might belong to the spirited part of his soul (τὸ θυμοειδές), since in [A6] we learn that the non-rational parts of the soul can have beliefs. The expression that someone (τις) has a sense that the appetitive desire is shameful, while ambiguous, might nonetheless still indicate that the spirited part of the soul itself holds to this belief.

§A.III. <u>High Standards of Belief (δόξα) in Plato's *Sophist*, *Theaetetus*, *Timaeus* and *Philebus*</u>

While *Republic* 10 seems to attribute beliefs to the non-rational parts of the soul, we should first note that in the context of the passage, the beliefs in question are exemplified as things *appearing* a certain way: an object appears large or small from a distance, a stick appears bent in water, and artistic renditions play off of appearances to present illusions (*Republic* 10, 602c7–e3). In the immediate examples that precede [A6] something seems (φαίνεσθαι) a certain way in terms of visual representation, not necessarily in terms of propositional statements, where the non-rational part of the soul would have a belief *that*, for instance, the sun is as wide as a human hand.

For something to seem a certain way to the spirited or appetitive part of the soul, i.e. for the sun to seem small or a stick in water bent, need not involve an epistemic notion of belief, where one sees a *reason* to think, for example, *that* the sun is small. Instead, such visual representations may only imply that the non-rational parts of the soul have non-epistemic

representations in which, for example, the sun *appears* small to the non-rational part of the soul in question, not that there is a rational belief about the size of the sun that the non-rational part of the soul has formed.[10] So, in *Republic* 10, it seems possible to consider Socrates' view on belief as falling into two types: beliefs as representations that are non-epistemic and mere appearances, lacking measurement and calculation, and beliefs as representations that are epistemic, can be formulated in propositional statements, and are subject to measurement and calculation.

Other passages in Plato's dialogues outright deny belief (δόξα) to the non-rational parts of the soul or define belief as involving rational capacities that the non-rational parts of the soul do not possess. When we turn to Plato's *Sophist*, for example, it at first might seem, as in *Republic* 10 (602e4–603a8=[A6]) that the non-rational part of the soul's capacity for representation (φαντασία) implies its ability to form beliefs (δοξάζειν, δόξα):

[A7] "φαίνεται" δὲ ὃ λέγομεν σύμμειξις αἰσθήσεως καὶ δόξης.

What we mean when we say "It seems" is a mixture of perception and belief.
(Plato, *Sophist* 264b1–2)

While having something appear a certain way (φαίνεσθαι) to the non-rational parts of the soul seems to imply the formation of beliefs (δόξαι) in both this passage and in [A6], we quickly come to the problem of attributing rational thought (διάνοια) to the non-rational parts of the soul, if the understanding of δόξα remains the same between *Republic* 10 and throughout Plato's *Sophist*. For the lines immediately preceding and following [A7] argue that belief (δόξα) "occurs in the soul according to thought" (ἐν ψυχῇ κατὰ διάνοιαν ἐγγίγνηται, 264a1–2) and is

[10] Cf. Moss 2012b, pp. 272, 279–80 and n. 37. Cf. also Caston 2006, pp. 331–5: Aristotle in contrast to Plato distinguishes an *appearance* from a *belief*, such as in the case that the sun *appears* a foot wide even though we *believe* that it is larger than the earth (*On the Soul* 3.3, 428a24–b9), or as one line in the Müller-Lyer diagram *appears* longer than the other, even after we measure and come to *know* that they are equal, and thereby makes our capacity to form representations and have appearances (φαντασίαι) more rudimentary than our ability to form beliefs (p. 332). At least in this example from *Republic* 10, Socrates seems to set representations of this kind in parity with beliefs so that they are able to account for critical psychic conflict of belief between the non-rational and rational parts of the soul.

"the end result of thought" (διανοίας ἀποτελεύτησις, 264b1). But thought or thinking belongs to the rational part of the soul, not to the non-rational parts. So, it would seem from the further details we gather in Plato's *Sophist* that belief-formation so understood must be denied to the spirited part of the soul, since it requires thought and is the end-product of *thinking*, which is not an activity that the spirited part of the soul, nor the appetitive part, is capable of performing. Beliefs according to this definition, then, must originate from the rational part of the soul. What Socrates called a belief held by the non-rational parts of the soul in *Republic* 10, if they are meant to originate in the non-rational parts of the soul, will not be considered a belief in the *Sophist*, but a non-doxastic representation (φαντασία).[11] Alternatively, if the beliefs held by the non-rational parts of the soul are beliefs according to the *Sophist*'s definition, they must originate from thinking in the rational part of the soul; they will not have been *formed* in the non-rational parts of the soul.

Plato's *Theaetetus*, like the *Sophist*, also sets the bar for belief and belief-formation out of reach for the non-rational parts of the soul. After discussing the possibility of true belief, which might be knowledge (κινδυνεύει δὲ ἡ ἀληθὴς δόξα ἐπιστήμη εἶναι, 187b5–6), Socrates describes belief (δόξα) as the formation of a statement (λόγος) to oneself:

[A8] ἔγωγε "τὸ δοξάζειν" λέγειν καλῶ καὶ τὴν δόξαν λόγον εἰρημένον, οὐ μέντοι πρὸς ἄλλον οὐδὲ φωνῇ, ἀλλὰ σιγῇ πρὸς αὑτόν.

> I mean by "forming a belief" that one is making a statement and that a belief is a statement that has been expressed; however, I do not mean that it is expressed to another person or is uttered aloud, but that it is expressed to oneself silently.
>
> (Plato, *Theaetetus* 190a4–6)

Belief here is propositional: to form a belief is to make a statement (λέγειν), one that is

[11] See also Brogaard 2014, p. 383, who argues that visual representations are not beliefs but nonetheless can conflict with the beliefs: "[V]isual seemings clearly are not belief states. You can believe that p even if it visually seems to you that not-p." For an overview of contemporary debates on conflicting beliefs and non-doxastic representational states see Quilty-Dunn 2015.

understood, presumably, according to thought (κατὰ διάνοιαν, *Sophist* 264a1–2).[12] Further, if true belief is the same as knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) or requires a similar process of rational activity as coming to have knowledge, which is being seriously entertained in this passage (*Theaetetus* 187a7–8), then it also will require calculations (ἀναλογίσματα, 186c2–3), reasoning (συλλογισμός, 186d3), and reflection on one's views, with the soul busying itself by itself (αὐτὴ καθ' αὑτὴν πραγματεύηται) about these things (187a5–6). All of these belong to the rational part of the soul as its own peculiar activities and are denied to the non-rational parts of the soul.[13] As in the *Sophist*, belief-formation appears peculiar to the rational part of the soul and impossible for the non-rational parts of the soul because it requires rational thought.

In Plato's *Philebus*, belief-formation once more seems to require rational processes of thought that belong to the rational part of the soul. In a discussion on the nature of belief and belief-formation, Socrates and Protarchus discuss how one comes to have a *definite* belief (διαδοξάζειν) about something (38b12–13). In the discussion, they define belief (δόξα) as a statement (λόγος, 38e3–4) that is either true or false (38b6–7). One holds a belief, for instance, about the object in the distance, stating (λέγειν) to oneself or another *that* it is a man (ὡς ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος, 38d5–e7). As in the *Sophist* and *Theaetetus*, the belief is a propositional statement.[14]

The *Philebus* additionally gives the description of a scribe (γραμματεύς) within the soul, who, as it were, writes the propositional statements in the souls of individuals (γράφειν ἡμῶν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς…λόγους, 39a3) as they form beliefs. When the propositional statements are true, the belief is true (δόξα ἀληθής); when the statements are false, the belief is false

[12] As we will see below with the *Philebus*, these statements are truth-apt. As such, I take it that they express propositions. See Evans 2008, p. 96, n. 14, quoted below in n. 18. For an argument that the inner-speech that occurs in Plato's dialogues is not propositional cf. Nuchelmans 1973, p. 21.
[13] Cf. Cooper 1999a, p. 184.
[14] Cf. Penner 1970, pp. 166–78; Evans 2008, p. 96, n. 14; Moss 2012b, p. 264.

(39a3–7). So, once again, it seems that the process of forming a belief, in general, requires statements (λόγοι) with propositional content.[15]

In the context of the last passage from Plato's *Philebus*, there is reason to think the definition that Socrates and Protarchus come to in 38b6–39a7 could apply only to beliefs formed by rational reflection and calculation as it is described in *Republic* 10. In the context of the *Philebus* passage just discussed, Socrates and Protarchus describe common experiences in which someone wants to get a clear sense of an object in the distance and come to a correct belief about what it is:

[A9] πολλάκις ἰδόντι τινὶ πόρρωθεν μὴ πάνυ σαφῶς τὰ καθορώμενα συμβαίνειν βούλεσθαι κρίνειν φαίης ἂν ταῦθ' ἅπερ ὁρᾷ;

> Would you not say that it often happens that someone wants to make a judgment about what they see when those objects are not very clear because they are looking from a distance far away? (Plato, *Philebus* 38c5–7)

The scenario so described should remind us of the one given in *Republic* 10 above, where things viewed at a distance can give a false impression of size or, when the light is refracted through water, a false sense of shape. These first impressions must be corrected by a rational process of measurement or calculation (μετρεῖν, κατὰ τὰ μέτρα) if one is to come to a better determination of the actual size or shape of the objects. The first appearances that do not take measurement or calculation into account are attributed to the non-rational parts of the soul in *Republic* 10. Only the rational part of the soul uses calculation and measurement to come to a more accurate determination.

[15] Cf. Erginel 2013, pp. 207–8. Erginel wants to reject this conclusion. Although he does not draw out his own argument for the *Philebus* on this point, he seems to be entertaining the notion that the non-rational parts of the soul also have their own inner scribes that form beliefs. Based on the high standards of belief-formation of propositional statements (λόγοι) elsewhere in Plato's works and the context of the passage leading up to the discussion of the inner scribe, which I address below, I do not see how Erginel's proposal fits with the Platonic psychology we see developed on belief-formation.

So, before proceeding further with the example, I would like to note that Socrates and Protarchus at this point in the discussion *already* are describing a situation in which a person seems to be *reflecting* on the appearance of objects, that is, someone is already at the stage of questioning appearances (*Philebus* 38c12–d3), presumably the immediate and unreflected ones they already have, and considering rational means of measurement to come to a more definite conclusion, that is, to make a judgment (κρίνειν) between appearances. The beliefs being formed at this point, marked by the verb διαδοξάζειν, "to come to a definite belief," are using a rational capacity to reflect on and calculate about an appearance in order to form a belief. How one comes to have the immediate, unreflective appearances is not covered under the definition of belief in this discussion of the *Philebus*.

Turning to Plato's *Timaeus*, Socrates outright denies belief (δόξα) along with reasoning (λογισμός) and intellect (νοῦς) to the appetitive part of the soul. The appetitive part of the soul has no participation in these capacities; it only has participation in sense-perception, pleasure, and pain (*Timaeus* 77b3–6).[16] The appetitive part of the soul in the *Timaeus* is also not capable of understanding statements (λόγοι) due to its limited cognitive capacities. The gods in the *Timaeus*, when constructing the human body, took into account the fact that the appetitive part of the soul

[A10] λόγου μὲν οὔτε συνήσειν ἔμελλεν, εἴ τέ πῃ καὶ μεταλαμβάνοι τινὸς αὐτῶν αἰσθήσεως, οὐκ ἔμφυτον αὐτῷ τὸ μέλειν τινῶν ἔσοιτο λόγων, ὑπὸ δὲ εἰδώλων καὶ φαντασμάτων νυκτός τε καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν μάλιστα ψυχαγωγήσοιτο.

was not going to be able to understand a statement, and even if in some way it had a participation in some perception of them, it would not have a natural capacity to take thought of statements, but it would be led especially by images and phantoms night and

[16] Socrates states that the third type of soul (τοῦ τρίτου ψυχῆς εἴδους), which is located between the midriff and naval (ὃ μεταξὺ φρενῶν ὀμφαλοῦ τε), which in 70d7–e2 he made clear is the appetitive part of the soul, "has no participation in belief or reasoning or intellect whatsoever (ᾧ δόξης μὲν λογισμοῦ τε καὶ νοῦ μέτεστιν τὸ μηδέν), but only participation in sense-perception and pleasure and pain with desires (αἰσθήσεως δὲ ἡδείας καὶ ἀλγεινῆς μετὰ ἐπιθυμιῶν). Cf. Lorenz 2006, p. 75.

day. (Plato, *Timaeus* 71a3–7)

The appetitive part of the soul has no access to propositional content: it cannot understand (συνιέναι) statements. Instead, it operates based on appearances, or representations, described as images and phantoms (εἴδωλα καὶ φαντάσματα) in this passage. The appetitive part of the soul's capacity is so limited that the gods devise a method for the rational part of the soul to communicate with appetite through images, giving the body an organ, the liver, that translates propositional statements into imagistic representations. The force of thoughts from the intellect (τῶν διανοημάτων ἡ ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ…δύναμις) is translated to provide images (εἴδωλα παρέχοντι) and impressions (τύπους), as though being reflected in a mirror (ἐν κατόπτρῳ, 71b3–5). Rational beliefs are thus translated, as though the soul paints phantoms (φαντάσματα ἀποζωγραφοῖ, 71c3–4) to which the appetitive part of the soul responds. Their mode of representation effects a response from the appetitive part of the soul, even though it has no access to propositional statements that they represent and takes no thought of them propositionally.[17]

The *Philebus* account also similarly describes a process in which the propositional content of beliefs, the statements engraved in the soul by the inner scribe (γραμματεύς), are translated into imagistic representations. The scribe within the soul is followed by a different worker within the soul, the painter (ζωγράφος):

[17] I do not mean to imply here that the imagistic representations are not themselves somehow propositional in nature, just that the appetitive part of the soul cannot understand them as propositional statements. My point in making this distinction will be clear in the following note. Bobonich (2010a, pp. 151–4) argues that the imagistic interpretation of appetitive representational content will fail to account for all of the content needed for all appetitive desires. It will not be able to pick out salient features and deny others that are necessary for constructing desires for particular objects or types of objects. Take, for instance, the imagistic representation of the erotic desire of an adolescent male who desires to have sex with (a) a human, who is (b) not a parent and (c) not a sibling. How, Bobonich (2010a, p. 153) asks, will an image relate the negations in (b) and (c) without some linguistic predication?

[A11] ὃς μετὰ τὸν γραμματιστὴν τῶν λεγομένων εἰκόνας ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τούτων γράφει.

who, after the scribe, draws images in the soul of these things that have been stated. (Plato, *Philebus* 39b6–7)

These imagistic representations have the same truth-conditions as the statements they depict (39c4–5), i.e. they bear the same propositional content in an imagistic manner.[18] Perhaps surprisingly, the imagistic representations *follow* the representations of information in propositional statements. We might have suspected that imagistic representation preceded the formation of propositional statements, but Socrates indicates the reverse here.[19] Protarchus himself seems surprised by this and asks Socrates to clarify not only how the inner painter does this work, but also *when*:

[A12] πῶς δὴ τοῦτον αὖ καὶ πότε λέγομεν;
ὅταν ἀπ' ὄψεως ἤ τινος ἄλλης αἰσθήσεως τὰ τότε δοξαζόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα ἀπαγαγών τις τὰς τῶν δοξασθέντων καὶ λεχθέντων εἰκόνας ἐν αὑτῷ ὁρᾷ πως.

Tell me again,[20] how do we say that he does this and when?
Whenever someone takes the beliefs that are being formed and made into statements from sight or some other sense-perception and in some way sees images in himself of the beliefs that were formed and put into statements. (Plato, *Philebus* 39b8–c1)

---

[18] Cf. Evans 2008, p. 96, n. 14: "I translate λόγοι here as 'propositions' rather than 'sentences' because it is not clear that Socrates wants us to think of these psychologically inscribed items as natural language expressions. In fact, given what he says here about their relation to beliefs and assertions, it would seem that he wants them to serve as all-purpose truth-apt contents for anything from pictures and inscriptions to thoughts and speech-acts." In my correspondence with Evans, he has agreed with me that if Plato has not changed his mind between the *Timaeus* and *Philebus*, the appetitive part of the soul understands imagistic representations, which translate or depict the propositions (λόγοι) of the rational part of the soul *non-propositionally*. For the imagistic representations must have the same propositional content as the propositional statements they depict, since their truth-conditions are the same. But since the appetitive part of the soul cannot understand the propositional statements, it is presumably persuaded by imagistic representations without having access to and understanding the content propositionally. For a similar distinction between a subject having propositional content but not being able to access that content see Sorabji 1993, p. 22. Sorabji argues that Stoic propositions (λεκτά) may be the sort of thing that animals perceive, though they cannot themselves understand the content so as to verbalize the propositions: "[T]he texts repeatedly insist on using the modal idea that such propositional appearances are *verbalisable*, not that they are *verbalised*. If they are in fact verbalised, this is due to an independent operation of the mind."

[19] Cf. Evans 2008, p. 96, n. 15: "It is worth noting here that Plato's view about the relative priority of discursive content to pictorial content in the formation of perceptual beliefs is the converse of the consensus view today. Most of us now suppose that it is the writer who follows the painter, not the other way round."

[20] αὖ can be used to mark impatience in conversation. Cf. LSJ, s.v. αὖ, and Homer, *Iliad* 1.540; Aeschylus, *Libation Bearers* 1066 (both cited by LSJ).

If this is meant to be a general account for mental representations, then beliefs given as statements (λόγοι) with propositional content will always precede imagistic representations.

Compare the results from the *Timaeus* and the *Philebus* with the type of belief we found attributed to the non-rational parts of the soul in *Republic* 10. In the *Timaeus*, we find the appetitive part of the soul capable of having access to and responding to imagistic representations such as images and phantoms (εἴδωλα καὶ φαντάσματα). So far, this would still count as a belief that the non-rational parts of the soul are capable of having in *Republic* 10. But, in the *Timaeus*, this kind of representation does not count as a belief. It appears that the definition of belief (δόξα) differs between the *Republic* and *Timaeus*.[21] What marks the difference? Statements (λόγοι) with propositional content are now required in the *Timaeus* to count as belief (δόξα). The appetitive part of the soul lacks the capacity to hold a belief, inasmuch as it does not understand propositional statements (λόγου οὔτε συνήσειν). So, while agreement (ὁμοδοξεῖν) between the rational and non-rational parts of the soul in *Republic* 4, when they are in harmony (442c9–d2), might seem to imply that the beliefs in question are understood in the same manner by both the rational and non-rational parts of the soul, the *Timaeus* describes a mechanism by which a belief, understood as a propositional statement, can be translated into a representation that it does not understand propositionally but to which it can still somehow agree.

The *Philebus* account likewise holds that belief is propositional in form, but that it can be

[21] Lorenz (2006, pp. 72–3) holds that Plato narrows the meaning of δόξα between the *Republic* and *Timaeus*, but that his understanding of the appetitive part of the soul's capacity to hold to certain representations as beliefs remains the same in both dialogues. He entertains the notion that the city-soul analogy presses Socrates to call the appearances that the non-rational parts of the soul hold to "beliefs" to maintain the symmetry with the lower classes agreeing (ὁμοδοξεῖν) and being in harmony (ὁμονοεῖν) with the highest class or rulers. Cf. Moss 2012b, p. 274, n. 26. Bobonich (2002, pp. 295–350, and 2010a), however, holds that Plato has changed his view on the capacities of the lower parts of the soul, which after the *Republic* cannot have beliefs but instead are dependent on the rational part of the soul for representational content.

translated into an imagistic representation that is not a propositional statement. The *Philebus* adds two further details. First, imagistic representations of beliefs all stem from statements with propositional content within the soul. The formation of beliefs as statements with propositional content precedes the representation of images that bear that content. Secondly, all of the imagistic representations are truth-apt and have the same truth conditions as the statements that they depict. That indicates that in the *Philebus* the images somehow *bear* the propositional content of the statements, even though the appetitive part of the soul cannot access this content propositionally.

What of the spirited part in the *Timaeus*? Unlike the appetitive part of the soul, we find that the spirited part of the soul responds to propositional statements. The spirited part reacts angrily when the rational part of the soul gives a *report* that something wrong is happening:

[A13] τὸ μετέχον οὖν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀνδρείας καὶ θυμοῦ, φιλόνικον ὄν, κατῴκισαν ἐγγυτέρω τῆς κεφαλῆς…ἵνα τοῦ λόγου κατήκοον ὂν κοινῇ μετ' ἐκείνου βίᾳ τὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν κατέχοι γένος, ὁπότ' ἐκ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τῷ τ' ἐπιτάγματι καὶ λόγῳ μηδαμῇ πείθεσθαι ἑκὸν ἐθέλοι· τὴν δὲ δὴ καρδίαν ἅμμα τῶν φλεβῶν καὶ πηγὴν τοῦ περιφερομένου κατὰ πάντα τὰ μέλη σφοδρῶς αἵματος εἰς τὴν δορυφορικὴν οἴκησιν κατέστησαν, ἵνα, ὅτε ζέσειεν τὸ τοῦ θυμοῦ μένος, τοῦ λόγου παραγγείλαντος ὥς τις ἄδικος περὶ αὐτὰ γίγνεται πρᾶξις ἔξωθεν ἢ καί τις ἀπὸ τῶν ἔνδοθεν ἐπιθυμιῶν, ὀξέως διὰ πάντων τῶν στενωπῶν πᾶν ὅσον αἰσθητικὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι, τῶν τε παρακελεύσεων καὶ ἀπειλῶν αἰσθανόμενον, γίγνοιτο ἐπήκοον καὶ ἕποιτο πάντῃ, καὶ τὸ βέλτιστον οὕτως ἐν αὐτοῖς πᾶσιν ἡγεμονεῖν ἐῷ.

Therefore, the part of the soul that has a share of courage and anger, since it is victory-loving, they [the gods] made to dwell closer to the head…in order that, since it is obedient to reason, it might suppress with force together with reason the group of desires whenever they are entirely unwilling, as far as they are concerned, to obey any of the commands and words from the central governance of the soul. They established the heart, the connection point for the veins and the source of blood that flows vigorously throughout all the limbs, as the guard-house, so that, whenever the rage of the spirit should boil, because reason reports that some unjust action from outside is occurring concerning these [parts of the body] or even from the desires within, every sense-perceptive organ in the body, quickly perceiving exhortations and threats through all narrow passageways, might become obedient and follow along in every way and allow the best part to rule in this way in everything. (Plato, *Timaeus* 70a2–c1)

In this passage, not only is the spirited part of the soul in alliance with the rational part, as we have seen already above, but it also reacts to information in propositional form, here described as a report by reason *that* (ὡς) something unjust has happened (τοῦ λόγου παραγγείλαντος ὥς τις ἄδικος…γίγνεται πρᾶξις). Unlike the appetitive part of the soul, the spirited part seems to understand the propositional statements themselves *propositionally*, without requiring that this information be translated into a different format of representation. The spirited part of the soul reacts to this propositional content, boiling, as it were, because it receives and seems to understand this information.[22]

This passage, however, only suggests that the spirited part of the soul is capable of *receiving* propositional beliefs from the rational part of the soul and responding to them. We are given no indication that this part of the soul is able to *form* evaluative beliefs or judgments on its own apart from the rational part of the soul. As we will see below, Plato's dialogues generally describe the flow of information as top-down, from reason to the non-rational parts of the soul.

§A.IV. The Top-Down View: Receiving Beliefs from the Rational Part of the Soul in Plato

In the *Timaeus* and *Philebus* passages discussed above, we see that the rational part of the soul is capable of influencing the lower parts of the soul, passing along information to structure the beliefs or imagistic representations to which the lower parts of the soul respond. For the appetitive part of the soul, we are given two images of how the rational part translates propositional content into representations by which the appetitive part can be persuaded (ψυχαγωγεῖσθαι, *Timaeus* 71a3–7) without having access to the propositional content: the reflection of statements through the liver (*Timaeus* 71b3–5, c3–4) and the depiction of statements

[22] Cf. Moss 2012b, pp. 274–5. Given his view that the cognitive capacities of the non-rational parts of the soul are impoverished after the *Republic*, Bobonich (2002, pp. 297–8; 2010a, pp. 154–8) argues that the *Timaeus* exaggerates the agent-like capacities of the non-rational parts of the soul, especially the spirited part.

by the inner scribe (*Philebus* 39b6–c1) as imagistic representations.

Additionally, as noted above, the process of information acquisition from sense-perception in the *Philebus* passage has an intermediary step before it reaches the appetitive part of the soul. Information gathered from sense-perceptions is formulated as propositional statements by the rational part of the soul *before* being translated into imagistic representations to which the appetitive part of the soul responds. If the *Philebus* passage is a general account of the flow of information, it appears to be top-down: all perceptual information is formulated as propositional statements by the rational part of the soul before it reaches the appetitive part of the soul. There is no direct link between sense-perception and the imagistic representations to which the appetitive part of the soul responds in this passage.

The flow of information to the spirited part of the soul also seems to be top-down in the *Timaeus* and *Republic*. The spirited part of the soul responds to the report of reason in the *Timaeus*, as we saw above (70a2–b5=[A13]), which can evince spirited reactions such as anger, disgust, and shame. Unlike for the appetitive part of the soul, there is no indication that the propositional statements must be translated for the spirited part to understand and obey. Nevertheless, for both the spirited and appetitive parts of the soul, information flows from the rational part of the soul, which structures the information as propositional statements before it is passed on to the spirited or appetitive parts of the soul. Information flow is top-down.

In similar fashion, the spirited part of the soul in the *Republic* exhibits courage when it holds steadfastly to the commands that it receives from the rational part of the soul:

[A14] καὶ ἀνδρεῖον δὴ οἶμαι τούτῳ τῷ μέρει καλοῦμεν ἕνα ἕκαστον, ὅταν αὐτοῦ τὸ θυμοειδὲς διασῴζῃ διά τε λυπῶν καὶ ἡδονῶν τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων παραγγελθὲν δεινόν τε καὶ μή.

And I suppose that we call each individual courageous in virtue of this part of the soul, whenever his spirited part preserves through pleasures and pains the command given by

reason on what one should shrink back from or not. (Plato, *Republic* 4, 442b10–c2)

As in the *Timaeus*, the spirited part of the soul receives instruction, or a report (παραγγελθέν), and accepts it, adopting a belief that originates in the rational part of the soul. Agreement (ὁμοδοξεῖν, 4, 442c9–d2) between the rational and non-rational parts of the soul occurs when the flow of information is top-down.[23]

If the top-down view is correct, then we will need a story to account for the possibility of psychic conflict of belief. As we saw in *Republic* 10, psychic conflict of belief, wherein two parts of the soul hold contrary beliefs, is a common experience (602e4–603a8=[A6]). Yet, if the top-down view is correct, all beliefs originate in the rational part of the soul. So, we need an explanation of how the belief content of the lower parts of the soul come to be in conflict with the belief content of the rational part of the soul, since the rational part of the soul is responsible for the beliefs the non-rational parts of the soul come to have.

Further, if passionate responses such as desire and aversion for objects, actions, and the whole host of opposing attitudes described in *Republic* 4 (437b1–4=[A5], b6–7) are responses to belief or representational content, then the stakes are even higher. Not only is the argument for partition due to conflicting beliefs in *Republic* 10 at stake, but also the argument used to establish psychic tripartition in *Republic* 4. We will need an account of how belief content that comes from the rational part of the soul leads to attitudes in the non-rational parts of the soul that are in opposition to its own attitudes. Otherwise, if rational belief-formation stands between all sense-perception and non-rational responses and, moreover, structures the information that the non-

[23] I take it that the agreement that Socrates describes here is normative for the just soul. There are conditions, as explored in *Republic* 8 and 9, where reason *gives in* to the demands and desires of the non-rational parts of the soul, but in such cases, we might refer to reason as *yielding* rather than agreeing with the lower parts of the soul. It is compatible with the top-down flow of information view to think that while information must be structured by the rational part of the soul before reaching the non-rational parts of the soul, the non-rational parts of the soul may still vary in their response to this information and oppose the intentions of reason, which I touch on next.

rational parts of the soul respond to, it looks as though the rational part of the soul determines all non-rational activities. The control of the soul will resemble that of a puppeteer controlling the lower parts of the soul from above. Never mind that each part of the soul has certain desires peculiar to itself (*Republic* 9, 580d–581d), reason will determine how each desire is pursued, since it will determine what information is provided to each part of the soul, which leads to the pursuit of objects toward which each part exhibits its characteristic pro-attitudes.[24]

One possible solution to this problem, which still holds that all information passes through the rational part of the soul, is to stress that the non-rational parts of the soul respond only to certain *types* of information they receive from the rational part of the soul. We have already seen in the *Timaeus* and *Philebus* that the appetitive part of the soul cannot understand statements of the rational part propositionally. If we apply this to the *Republic* 10 scenario, the appetitive part has no access to the measurement and calculation that goes into determining the size or shape of objects by the rational part of the soul. The appetitive part only has access to some of the information represented. As for the spirited part of the soul, suppose that it also responds to some information it receives from the rational part of the soul but fails to understand

[24] For the puppeteer metaphor, see Plato, *Phaedo* 94b4–e6 and *Laws* 1, 644d7–645b1. The puppet metaphor of *Laws* 1 (644d7–645b1) does not ascribe all agency within the soul to the rational part of the soul. The passions in that metaphor have their own force and direction; they are not inert strings pulled by the rational part of the soul: "the passions within us like strings or certain lines that are internal, both draw us and pull against each other, since they are opposed, set toward contrary actions" (τὰ πάθη ἐν ἡμῖν οἷον νεῦρα ἢ σμήρινθοί τινες ἐνοῦσαι σπῶσίν τε ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀλλήλαις ἀνθέλκουσιν ἐναντίαι οὖσαι ἐπ' ἐναντίας πράξεις, 644e1–3). Nevertheless, we can imagine that if the rational part of the soul understands and can accurately predict how the different passions react to information, and if the rational part of the soul can fully control what information it conveys to the lower parts of the soul, it would ultimately be responsible for shaping the passionate responses that occur within the soul. For the puppeteer metaphor in Plutarch see *On the Sign of Socrates* 588F7–589A3: "But the soul of man, stretched with a myriad of impulses, is like the instrument that is most easily turned of all instruments with twisted strands that move toward an intended direction when it receives a twist from someone who touches it with due proportion. For the starting-points of the passions and impulses are stretched out into the part that understands. When this is disturbed, the passions are pulled and draw and stretch the man" (ψυχὴ δ' ἀνθρώπου μυρίαις ὁρμαῖς οἷον ὕσπληξιν ἐντεταμένη μακρῷ πάντων ὀργάνων εὐστροφώτατόν ἐστιν, ἄν τις κατὰ λόγον ἅπτηται, ῥοπὴν λαβοῦσα πρὸς τὸ νοηθὲν κινεῖσθαι. ἐνταῦθα γὰρ εἰς τὸ νοοῦν αἱ τῶν παθῶν καὶ ὁρμῶν κατατείνουσιν ἀρχαί, τούτου δὲ σεισθέντος ἑλκόμεναι σπῶσι καὶ συντείνουσι τὸν ἄνθρωπον). For the instrument described here with "twisted strands" (ὕσπληγες), see the automaton described in Hero, *Automata* 2.8. Cf. Frede 2010.

the importance of other information, which nevertheless remains important for determining the correct course of action in a given situation. To illustrate the point, we will take up the example in *Republic* 4 of Odysseus growing angry with himself out a sense of shame.

In differentiating the rational part of the soul from the spirited part of the soul, Socrates and Glaucon agree that the rational part alone is capable of determining what is *better or worse* in any given situation, while the spirited part of the soul, when it reacts in anger, does so *without calculation*:

[A15] ὃ ἄνω που ἐκεῖ εἴπομεν, τὸ τοῦ Ὁμήρου μαρτυρήσει, τὸ
"στῆθος δὲ πλήξας κραδίην ἠνίπαπε μύθῳ·"
ἐνταῦθα γὰρ δὴ σαφῶς ὡς ἕτερον ἑτέρῳ ἐπιπλῆττον πεποίηκεν Ὅμηρος τὸ ἀναλογισάμενον περὶ τοῦ βελτίονός τε καὶ χείρονος τῷ ἀλογίστως θυμουμένῳ.

> What we said before somewhere, the quotation from Homer, will bear witness [to this distinction between the rational part of the soul and the spirited part of the soul]:
> "Striking his breast, he spoke a word of rebuke to his heart" [*Odyssey* 20.17].
> In that passage, Homer clearly represents the part that calculates about what is better or worse as different from the part that it is rebuking, which is angry without calculation.
> (Plato, *Republic* 4, 441b3–c2)

The key difference here is the use of information and access to content. The rational part of the soul (τὸ λογιστικόν) calculates ((ἀνα-)λογίζεσθαι) concerning what is better or worse (περὶ τοῦ βελτίονός τε καὶ χείρονος). The spirited part of the soul, because it reacts without calculation (ἀλογίστως) to information, does not take into consideration further information that is important for determining what is better or worse.

Yet, while evaluation of what is better or worse is restricted to the rational part of the soul, the evaluation that something is wrong or inappropriate is not. The critical conflict between the spirited part and the rational part hinges, in fact, on the spirited part having grown angry over a perceived unjust suffering, i.e. an evaluation of the suffering as shameful and unjustly imposed

on oneself.[25] As we saw in the Leontius passage in *Republic* 4 that precedes this passage, anger follows upon the sense of shame one experiences when shameful actions have been committed by oneself or against oneself (440b9–c6).

It might be the case that the spirited part only responds to certain types of information, such as "treated unjustly," but not a determination that "it is best to wait," since it lacks the capacity, unlike the rational part of the soul, to calculate and weigh options about what is better or worse in a given situation. Once set in motion with an angry response, we find that the spirited part of the soul has a tendency to pursue its course of action doggedly:

[A16] τί δὲ ὅταν ἀδικεῖσθαί τις ἡγῆται; οὐκ [ὁ θυμὸς, 440c4] ἐν τούτῳ ζεῖ τε καὶ χαλεπαίνει καὶ συμμαχεῖ τῷ δοκοῦντι δικαίῳ καί, διὰ τὸ πεινῆν καὶ διὰ τὸ ῥιγοῦν καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα πάσχειν, ὑπομένων καὶ νικᾷ καὶ οὐ λήγει τῶν γενναίων, πρὶν ἂν ἢ διαπράξηται ἢ τελευτήσῃ ἢ ὥσπερ κύων ὑπὸ νομέως ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτῷ ἀνακληθεὶς πραϋνθῇ;

What about the case whenever someone supposes that he has been wronged unjustly? Does not the spirited passion in this man boil and grow vexed and ally itself to what seems just, suffer hunger, cold, and everything of that kind for it, enduring and

[25] In [A15] we have little context to determine whether or not Odysseus' angry reaction is due to a perceived sense of shame and injustice, but Socrates refers back to the earlier quotation of this line in *Republic* 3, 390d1–5, which provides additional context: "But if, I said, certain examples of endurance against all things are said or performed by men of importance, it should be seen or heard, as for example: 'Striking his breast, he rebuked his heart: / endure, heart, you have endured something even more shameful before' [*Odyssey* 20.17–18]" (ἀλλ' εἴ πού τινες, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, καρτερίαι πρὸς ἅπαντα καὶ λέγονται καὶ πράττονται ὑπὸ ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, θεατέον τε καὶ ἀκουστέον, οἷον καὶ τὸ "στῆθος δὲ πλήξας κραδίην ἠνίπαπε μύθῳ· / τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη· καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης"). The second line from Homer's *Odyssey* in this quotation reveals that the anger of the non-rational spirited part of the soul is due to something *shameful* that Odysseus has had to endure. This fits together with one of the causes of the spirited part's anger given in the Leontius example: one grows angry when he perceives that he has been treated unjustly. In the context of the passage in Homer's *Odyssey*, Odysseus fights the urge to slaughter his female servants for disgracing his home by sleeping with and making merry with the suitors who have become parasites and have acted insolently toward his wife and son (20.5–8). He is angry because he feels that he has been disgraced and treated unjustly by the servants of his household. His sense that he has endured shameful suffering drives him to desire to take vengeance. He deliberates on whether or not he should straightway exact revenge or wait until a more opportune time: "His heart within his dear breast was stirred: / he anxiously debated greatly in his heart and wits / whether he should rush upon them and deal death to each of the maidservants, / or should allow them still to consort with the insolent suitors / their final, last time; and his heart within him snarled like a dog" (τοῦ δ' ὠρίνετο θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισι· / πολλὰ δὲ μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν, / ἠὲ μεταΐξας θάνατον τεύξειεν ἑκάστῃ, / ἦ ἔτ' ἐᾷ μνηστῆρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισι μιγῆναι / ὕστατα καὶ πύματα· κραδίη δέ οἱ ἔνδον ὑλάκτει, Homer, *Odyssey* 20.9–13). Taking the context from the *Odyssey* together with the preceding quotation, we see that while the evaluation of the situation brings a sense of shame and anger with a desire for vengeance in Odysseus, this anger of the spirited part of his soul is opposed by the rational part that weighs out what is better or worse in the situation.

> overcoming and not letting up in its pursuit of noble actions until either it succeeds, perishes, or, like a dog called by the shepherd, becomes calm at the behest of the reason inside him? (Plato, *Republic* 4, 440c6–d3)

The spirited part of the soul reacts with an enduring angry passion, likened to a boiling and seething state that takes time to simmer down back to a calm. In this state, it continues its pursuit of the desired end until it achieves its purpose, which would be retaliation in the example of Odysseus here. Interestingly, Socrates states that its reaction is to what "seems just" (τῷ δοκοῦντι δικαίῳ) in the situation. This evaluation might be premature, an immediate response to a perceived injustice before all of the relevant information needed to determine whether one has suffered an injustice or what the best course of action is has been decided by more measured calculation. It might also be only partial, once again, since the spirited part of the soul may lack the capacity not only to calculate what is better or worse, but also to understand the outcomes of such calculations.[26]

According to Model 1, belief-formation occurs only in the rational part of the soul. So, in some sense, the rational part of the soul is responsible for the angry reaction that reason

---

[26]

Model 1: *Spirited Part Responds to Partial Information from Rational Evaluation*

Rational Part of the Soul		Spirited Part of the Soul
forms **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate**]**	→	*accepts* **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate**]**
weighs **Options [**Best to Retaliate Now OR Wait & Retaliate Later?**]**		*modifies* **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate**]** *through angry response to* **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate Now**]**
modifies **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate**]** *to* **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Best to Wait & Retaliate Later: Do Not Retaliate Now**]**		
holds **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Best to Wait & Retaliate Later; Do Not Retaliate Now**]**	**Critical Conflict**	*holds* **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate Now**]**
↓		↓
refuses Action **[**Retaliate Now**]**	**Critical Conflict**	*pursues* Action **[**Retaliate Now**]**

ultimately comes to oppose insofar as it provides the evaluative belief to which the spirited part of the soul reacts. It is not the case, however, that the rational part of the soul holds two contrary beliefs at the same time, in the same respect, etc. The initial evaluative belief that Odysseus suffers injustice and is being shamed originates in the rational part of the soul. The spirited part of the soul receives this evaluation from the rational part of the soul and grows angry. This anger incites a desire for immediate revenge. But, the evaluation is partial, not taking further considerations into account; it results apart from calculation (ἀλογίστως) of what is better or worse (περὶ τοῦ βελτίονός τε καὶ χείρονος) and fails to take into account that in the given situation, there are other factors that should count in determining how to respond and what actions to take. After calculating about the best course to take in the situation, the rational part of the soul modifies its own evaluative stance and decides that, while retaliation is called for in the situation, it would be best not to pursue that course right now, but at a later, more opportune moment. Critical conflict comes between the *final* evaluation of what is best to do in the circumstances, and also in the action that one part of the soul pursues and the other refuses.[27]

Even in the Model 1 view, the evaluation is *modified* by the spirited part of the soul. Granted, the modification I have outlined is merely temporal: the angry reaction seeks *immediate* satisfaction of compensatory revenge. Nevertheless, we could say that, in some way, limited

[27] Cf. Singpurwalla 2013, pp. 62–3, who argues for this interpretation of the Odysseus example in *Republic* 4: "And this is exactly what his spirit aims to do [eliminate the source of the disrespect (i.e. the maids and the suitors)], for there is no reason to think that it is not his reason [the rational part of his soul] that recommends that he eliminate the offensive behaviour. After all, his reason does not recommend ignoring this insult, but rather waiting until he can execute a more powerful revenge. The trouble for Odysseus is that his reason counsels both that this behaviour is disrespectful and should be eliminated and that it is better to wait. Thus, Odysseus' spirit must endure feeling shamed by the disrespectful behavior and not doing anything about it when its immediate impulse is to eliminate the behaviour promptly and show his strength and power" (p. 63). Cf. also Wilberding 2009, p. 365–8: "The conflict between reason and spirit comes about because the latter has a difficult time dealing with the former's beliefs. The spirited part only has ears for reason's beliefs concerning honor and shame, and so the belief that the current situation is insulting is going to evoke a spirited response in a way that the belief that the time to set things right is later will not" (p. 368).

though it may be, the spirited part of the soul is contributing to the evaluative belief it receives from the rational part of the soul. Its angry response calls for immediate action.[28]

Consider also a slightly modified version of Model 1, which denies that the spirited part of the soul can even modify the evaluative belief. Call this Model 2. Following suit with the top-down view in which information passes from the rational part of the soul to the lower parts of the soul, Model 2 also assumes that belief-formation occurs exclusively in the rational part of the soul. In Model 2, however, the rational part of the soul is more directly responsible for setting the spirited part of the soul in pursuit of immediate retaliation. Reason *decides* to pursue retaliation immediately (at t_1), but then very quickly changes its mind (μετανοεῖν) due to a calculation about what is better or worse. The rational part of the soul determines later (at t_2) that it is best not to retaliate now, but to wait for better timing and circumstances. The spirited part of the soul receives the first evaluative belief (at t_1) and follows in pursuing revenge immediately. The spirited part continues to hold to this initial belief, boiling and seething (at t_2), even after the rational part of the soul has formed a new evaluation and judgment opposed to the first. The spirited part in this scenario retains and preserves the initial evaluation and judgment of reason as we see it is wont to do in *Republic* 4, 442b10–c2 (=[A14]),[29] perhaps due to a sort of momentum in the passion of anger, like a boiling and seething that take time to abate.[30]

---

[28] Cf. Erginel 2013, pp. 207–8, who does not seem to entertain this possibility. As an objection to the top-down view, Erginel argues that it would be odd if false representations of the lower parts of the soul originate from the rational part of the soul, since it would attribute the false beliefs that belong to wicked people to the rational part of their souls. As I have argued here, it could be the case that the non-rational parts of the soul only understand and respond to certain kinds of information, which causes their variation from rational beliefs.

[29] Cf. Plutarch, *On the Control of Anger* 459E2–4: "For time produces in passion mitigation and delay that ends it and our judgment discovers both the appropriate manner and fitting severity of punishment" (ὅ τε γὰρ χρόνος ἐμποιεῖ τῷ πάθει διατριβὴν καὶ μέλλησιν ἐκλύουσαν ἥ τε κρίσις εὑρίσκει καὶ τρόπον πρέποντα καὶ μέγεθος ἁρμόττον κολάσεως).

[30] See the outline on the following page:

In this scenario, the rational part of the soul would be responsible for producing the two contrary evaluative representations, but would not hold to both at the same time. In Model 2, we see that one evaluation and judgment is formed initially at t_1, which the spirited part of the soul retains despite a reassessment and formation of a contrary evaluation and judgment by the rational part at t_2. All evaluations and judgments originate in the rational part of the soul, but the spirited part of the soul is able to receive and act upon these evaluations and judgments, even retaining them once the rational part of the soul has changed its evaluation.

In both Model 1 and 2, the spirited part of the soul reacts only to certain types of information, such as that an injustice has been committed or one has been shamed. The implication of this view, however, is that the spirited part of the soul will always react in certain ways that disregard potentially important information that should influence one's decisions to act. In cases in which one ought to wait to right others' wrongs, following the correct course of action will always require suppressing a spirited reaction when it arises, since it is deaf to the

---

Model 2: *Spirited Part Accepts and Holds to First Evaluation from the Rational Part*

Rational Part of the Soul		Spirited Part of the Soul
forms **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate Now**]** at t_1	→	*accepts* **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate Now**]** at t_1
↓		↓
pursues Action [Retaliate Now] at t_1	**Agreement**	*pursues* Action [Retaliate Now] at t_1
reassess **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate Now**]** at t_2		
weighs **Options [**Best to Retaliate Now OR Wait & Retaliate Later?**]** at t_2		
modifies **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate Now] *to* **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Best to Wait & Retaliate Later: Do Not Retaliate Now**]** at t_2	**Critical Conflict**	*holds* **Evaluative Belief [**Treated Unjustly: Retaliate Now**]** at t_2
↓		↓
refuses Action [Retaliate Now] at t_2	**Critical Conflict**	*pursues* Action **[**Retaliate Now**]** at t_2

information that determines it is better to wait. This has the troubling result that a well-functioning spirited part of the soul, when it reacts within its optimal parameters, will inevitably be opposed to our rational calculations in situations that call for delayed response. Obedience of the spirited part will require *yielding* to the psychic motion of the rational part, but not following the information that structures the spirited part of the soul's response. Unless the rational part of the soul has some means of communicating to the spirited part in terms that it understands, modifying its representations so that the spirited part yields to its commands as appropriate for satisfying the desire to right the wrong that has been committed, the spirited part of the soul does not seem to be in agreement with the rational part of the soul, at least not in understanding and holding to the same belief (ὁμοδοξεῖν).[31]

Model 2 also falls curiously close to the view provided by the Stoics in their denial of critical psychic conflict, which we encountered in Chapter 1, §III (Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 446E8–447A4=*SVF* 3.459=LS 65G=[T3]). Unlike the Stoic view, however, Model 2 would require that the spirited part's anger not be an after-effect from a change in the rational part of the soul, but that the spirited part of the soul continue to hold on to the initial evaluative belief at the same time that the rational part of the soul has a contrary evaluative belief. Otherwise, it will not count as a critical conflict of belief in [A6]. The explanation for why the spirited part holds this stance might be due to the, as it were, after-effect of anger's passionate momentum, but the spirited part will nonetheless be in critical conflict of belief with the rational part.

[31] Whatever the truth-conditions may be for the propositional statements that the rational part of the soul forms, the non-rational parts of the soul, because they are limited in their capacities to understand these propositions, may not be holding to the same beliefs. The truth-conditions could thus be different. Whether we attribute this change to modification of beliefs or merely due to the limited understanding of the content of the beliefs, the non-rational parts of the soul could hold and react to *different* belief content from the belief content they receive from the rational part of the soul.

Supposing that Model 1 or 2 is the correct way to interpret the flow of information in Plato's psychology, there is room for the information to be interpreted or responded to in different ways from the evaluative belief that the rational part of the soul forms. Evaluative beliefs involve more than just the raw information flowing from the rational part of the soul to the spirited part, since the spirited part of the soul is primed to react to certain types of information and not others.

§A.V. Spirited Evaluations Independent of Rational Evaluations in Plato

While Model 1 and 2 seem to fit with the *Timaeus* and *Philebus* passages analyzed above, there are hints in Plato's dialogues, and even in the *Timaeus*, that the lower parts of the soul may be able to form beliefs independently of the rational part of the soul, perhaps even through access to sense-perception without rational mediation. In a few passages, Socrates seems to indicate that in dream-states the rational part of the soul itself ceases to rule over the lower parts of the soul. A host of lawless and shameful desires are allowed to be roused and act without restraint from shame or reason (Plato, *Republic* 9, 571c3–d1). Feverish nightmares ensue *unless* certain better desires that are normally allied with reason (μετὰ λογοῦ) continue to restrain these lawless desires (571b3–c1) even when reason takes to rest (εὕδῃ, 571c3–4). The better desires here indicate spirited emotions which act on behalf of the rational part's desire to constrain errant desires *without* the rational part of the soul guiding this activity. So, in this instance, we seem to find a case in which spirited emotions operate *independently* of the rational part of the soul.

Something similar seems to occur in Plato's *Laws*, where the rational part of the soul is inactive while one is in a drunken state, though the passionate parts of soul are still roused and active, as in childhood, when the rational part of the soul is undeveloped (Plato, *Laws* 1, 645e1–3; 2, 672b–c). As in *Republic* 9, better passions that belong to the spirited part of the soul, such

as a sense of shame (αἰδῶς), help to keep worse desires in check (*Laws* 1, 631d6–632a2, 643c1–644a2, 647a4–b7; 2, 653a5–c8, 654c3–d3).

It seems likely that previous influence from the rational part of the soul still has an effect on the spirited part of the soul's evaluations. The spirited part is characterized as particularly apt to *retain* information and beliefs from the rational part of the soul, since it preserves the dictates of reason through thick and thin as it holds fast to what is deemed noble or shameful ([A14]), retaining certain standards of by which what is honorable and shameful are distinguished (*Republic* 3, 401c4–402a4; 4, 441a2–3; 8, 551a4–5). Yet it also seems the spirited part must still be able to *apply* these standards in particular instances or against certain types of appetitive desires on its own in dream-states and inebriated states, without the instruction of the rational part of the soul. The spirited part of the soul seems to apply standards of what is honorable / shameful by evaluating actions and desires, i.e. forming beliefs about the appropriateness of actions and desires.[32] But this capacity for belief-formation and evaluation in the spirited part of the soul is only hinted at in both the *Laws* and *Republic*.

Against the top-down view of information flow we found in the *Philebus*, there are also hints that the spirited and appetitive parts may have intimate access to sense-perception without reason standing as an intermediary. The gods in the *Timaeus* equip human souls with a

[32] Cf. Nussbaum 1986, p. 216: "[I]n the second book of the *Laws*, we are told that the character of young citizens will be tested by putting the intellect to sleep through drunkenness. By observing the choices they make in this 'mad' condition, we will see how their souls are trained with respect to values. It is clear that this test works only given a belief in the independent discriminating power of sense and emotion; in the psychology of the *Republic* the drunken sleep of intellect simply releases bestial urges and could show nothing of moral value." While I agree with Nussbaum's analysis of *Laws* 2, it seems clear to me that the *same* discriminatory power must be in use in *Republic* 9 when the rational part of the soul is asleep and a sense of shame, belonging to the spirited part of the soul, continues to restrain bestial passions. The extent to which one has better desires to restrain bestial desires varies: there are many with strong bestial urges, though some hold them in check with their better desires, and a few individuals may have eliminated their bestial urges entirely or have only a few weak ones left (571b5–c1). The varying degrees of strength to restrain errant desires, moreover, seems to coordinate with the inculcation of moderation in the soul (571d7–8), which is a virtue. So, *contra* Nussbaum, I hold that in *Republic* 9, the discriminatory power of the spirited emotions is present and reveals moral value insofar as it reveals the extent to which one has cultivated moderation in the non-rational part of the soul.

passionate nature:

[A17] δεινὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα ἐν ἑαυτῷ παθήματα ἔχον, πρῶτον μὲν ἡδονήν, μέγιστον κακοῦ δέλεαρ, ἔπειτα λύπας, ἀγαθῶν φυγάς, ἔτι δ' αὖ θάρρος καὶ φόβον, ἄφρονε συμβούλω, θυμὸν δὲ δυσπαραμύθητον, ἐλπίδα δ' εὐπαράγωγον· αἰσθήσει δὲ ἀλόγῳ καὶ ἐπιχειρητῇ παντὸς ἔρωτι συγκερασάμενοι ταῦτα, ἀναγκαίως τὸ θνητὸν γένος συνέθεσαν.

> having dreadful and necessary passions within it, first pleasure, the greatest snare of evil, then pains, which cause avoidance of goods, and thereafter courage and fear, foolish counselors, anger that is hard to appease, and hope that easily leads one astray: they [the gods, when they constructed the soul,] constructed this mortal type out of necessity, mixing these passions with non-rational sense-perception and desire that is ready to try and get hold of anything. (Plato, *Timaeus* 69c8–d6 (continuation of [T29] in Chapter 3))

After listing different types of passions that belong to both the appetitive and spirited parts of the soul, Socrates adds that these passions have been mixed, or fused together, with sense-perception. So, while it appears from the *Philebus*, and possibly also from the description of images reflected off the liver in the *Timaeus* itself, that the non-rational parts of the soul depend on the rational part to evaluate and form beliefs about sense-perceptible information before they have access to this information, here it appears that there may be an intimate and immediate connection between passions and the information gathered through sense-perception.[33] In another passage of the *Timaeus*, there is an additional hint that the connection between the appetitive part of the soul and sense-perception may be direct: the appetitive part has no participation in reason, belief, and intellect, but it does participate in pleasure and pain with its desires and sense-perception (μέτεστιν αἰσθήσεως, *Timaeus* 77b3–6).[34] The top-down view may not be a general account of *all* representations,[35] though there is strong evidence in the *Philebus* and some

[33] Cf. Lorenz 2006, pp. 67–8, who holds to this view.
[34] Note, however, that the appetitive part of the soul may have a *sense* of the content of propositional statements in [A10], which would not count as sense-perception. The passage indicates that it is unlikely that it does. Nevertheless, we see in [A10] that αἴσθησις need not indicate sense-perception, since gathering a sense of the propositional statements formed within the soul will not be an apprehension accomplished by sense-perception.
[35] Cf. Kamtekar 2010, p. 137: "[T]he fact that reason *can* be the source of the appetitive part's images does not entail that it *alone* can be the source of such images." Kamtekar also makes a good point that if representational

supporting evidence in other parts of the *Timaeus* that all representations originate in the rational part of the soul, since it alone has the capacities necessary for belief-formation according to the high standards of belief set out in Plato's *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*, and *Philebus*.

content for the non-rational parts / motivational sources of the soul require reason or a rational part, then this view will be problematic for animals that lack rational capacities and plants that only have appetition (pp. 133–8).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackrill, John L. 1980. "Aristotle on *Eudaimonia*." In Rorty 1980, 15–33.

Adkins, Arthur W. H. 1963. "'Friendship' and 'Self-Sufficiency' in Homer and Aristotle." *The Classical Quarterly* 13 (1): 30–45.

Albini, Francesca. 1997. "Family and Formation of Character in Plutarch." In Mossman 1997, 59–71.

Alexiou, Evangelos. 2008. "*Eunoia* bei Plutarch: von den *Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae* zu den *Viten*." In Nikolaidis 2008, 365–86.

Alt, Karin. 1993. *Weltflucht und Weltbejahung: Zur Frage des Dualismus bei Plutarch, Numenios, Plotin*. Stuttgart: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.

Annas, Julia E. 1977. "Plato and Aristotle on Friendship and Altruism." *Mind* 86: 532–54.

---. 1981. *An Introduction to Plato's* Republic. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1992. *Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

---. 1993. *The Morality of Happiness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1999. *Platonic Ethics, Old and New*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Armstrong, David. 2011. "Epicurean Virtues, Epicurean Friendship: Cicero vs the Herculaneum Papyri." In *Epicurus and the Epicurean tradition*, edited by Jeff Fish and Kirk R. Sanders, 105–28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Armstrong, John M. 2004. "After the Ascent: Plato on Becoming Like God." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 26: 171–83.

Babbitt, Frank C., ed. and trans. 1928. "Plutarch: *A Letter of Condolence to Apollonius*." In *Plutarch,* Moralia*, vol. II*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Babut, Daniel. 1969a. *Plutarque,* De La Vertu Éthique*: introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

---. 1969b. *Plutarque et le stoïcisme*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

---. 1975. "Ἱστορία οἷον ὕλη φιλοσοφίας: histoire et réflexion morale dans l'œuvre de Plutarque." *Revue des Études Grecques* 88: 206–19.

---, ed. 1994. *Parerga. Choix d'articles de Daniel Babut (1974–1994)*. Lyon: Publications de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée.

---. 1994a. "Du scepticisme au dépassement de la raison: philosophie et foi religieuse chez Plutarque." In Babut 1994, 549–81.

---. 1996. “Plutarque, Aristote, et l’Aristotélisme.” In *Plutarchea Lovaniensia: A Miscellany of Essays on Plutarch*, edited by Luc Van der Stockt, 1–28. Leuven: Peeters Publishers.

---. 2007. “L’unité de l’Académie selon Plutarque.” In *A Platonic Pythagoras: Platonism and Pythagoreanism in the Imperial Age*, edited by Mauro Bonazzi, Carlos Lévy, and Carlos Steel, 63–98. Turnhout: Brepols.

Badnall, Toni. 2009. “Harvesting the Fruits of Virtue: *Philia*, *Eros* and *Arete* in Plutarch.” In Symposion *and* Philanthropia *in Plutarch*, edited by José Ribeiro Ferreira, Delfim Leão, Manuel Tröster, and Paula Barata Dias, 297–306. Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos.

Baltes, Matthias. 2000. “La dottrina dell’anima in Plutarco.” *Elenchos* 21: 245–70.

---. 2005. “Plutarchs Lehre von der Seele.” In *ΕΠΙΝΟΗΜΑΤΑ: kleine Schriften zur antiken Philosophie und homerischen Dichtung von Matthias Baltes*, edited by Luise Lackmann, 77–99. München and Leipzig: K. G. Sauer.

Baltussen, Han. 2009. “Personal Grief and Public Mourning in Plutarch’s *Consolation to His Wife*.” *American Journal of Philology* 130 (1): 67–98.

Barney, Rachel, Tad Brennan, and Charles Brittain, edd. 2012. *Plato and the Divided Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barrow, Reginald H. 1967. *Plutarch and his Times*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Bastianini, Guido and Anthony A. Long. 1992a. “Ierocle: *Elementi di Etica*.” In *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini*, vol. 1**, 268–451. Florence: Olschki.

---. 1992b. “Dopo la nuova edizione degli *Elementi di Etica* di Ierocle Stoico.” In *Studi su codici e papiri filosofici: Platone, Aristotele, Ierocle*, 221–49. Florence: Olschki.

Becchi, Francesco. 1975. “Aristotelismo ed antistoicismo nel *De virtute morali* di Plutarco.” *Prometheus* 1: 160–80.

---. 1978. “Aristotelismo funzionale nel *De virtute morali* di Plutarco.” *Prometheus* 4: 261–75.

---. 1981. “Platonismo medio ed etica plutarchea.” *Prometheus* 7: 125–45, 263–84.

---. 1990. *Plutarco,* La virtú etica*: testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Naples: D’Auria.

---. 1996. “Plutarco e la dottrina dell’ ὉΜΟΙΩΣΙΣ ΘΕΩΙ tra Platonismo ed Aristotelismo.” In *Plutarco e la religione: Atti del VI Convegno Plutarcheo (Ravello, 29–31 maggio 1995)*, edited by Italo Gallo, 321–35. Naples: D’Auria.

---. 1999. “Plutarco tra Platonismo e Aristotelismo: la filosofia come παιδεία dell’anima.” In Pérez Jiménez, García Lopez, and Aguilar 1999, 25–43.

---. 2005. “*Apatheia* e *metriopatheia* in Plutarco.” In *Plutarco e l’Età Ellenistica: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Firenze, 23–24 settembre 2004)*, edited by Angelo Casanova, 385–400. Florence: Università di Firenze.

---. 2012. “The Doctrine of the Passions: Plutarch, Posidonius and Galen.” In Roig Lanzillotta and Muñoz Gallarte 2012, 43–54.

---. 2014. “Plutarch, Aristotle and the Peripatetics.” In Beck 2014, 73–87.

Beck, Mark, ed. 2014. *A Companion to Plutarch*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Belfiore, Elizabeth. 1986. “Wine and Catharsis of the Emotions in Plato’s *Laws*.” *The Classical Quarterly* 36 (2): 421–37.

Bellanti, Alberto. 2003. “Aristotele pitagorico? La concezione della medietà nel *De Virtute Morali* di Plutarco.” *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 95 (1): 3–36.

---. 2007. “La teoria plutarchea della virtù tra platonismo, pitagorismo e aristotelismo.” In Volpe Cacciatore and Ferrari 2007, 223–64.

Bénatouïl, Thomas. 2007. “Le débat entre platonisme et stoïcisme sur la vie scolastique: Chrysippe, la Nouvelle Académie et Antiochus.” In *Stoic Platonism—Platonic Stoicism: The Dialogue between Platonism and Stoicism in Antiquity*, edited by Mauro Bonazzi and Christoph Helmig, 1–21. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Bénatouïl, Thomas and Mauro Bonazzi, edd. 2012. Theoria, Praxis*, and the Contemplative Life after Plato and Aristotle*. Leiden: Brill.

Beneker, Jeffrey. 2008. “Plutarch and the Role of *Eros* in a Marriage.” In Nikolaidis 2008, 689–99.

---. 2012. *The Passionate Statesman:* Eros *and Politics in Plutarch’s* Lives. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ben-Ze’ev, Aaron. 1997. “Emotions and Morality.” *The Journal of Value Enquiry* 31: 195–212.

Betegh, Gábor. 2010. “The Transmission of Ancient Wisdom: Texts, Doxographies, Libraries.” In *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, edited by Lloyd P. Gerson, vol. 1, 25–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blank, David L. 2011. “Reading Between the Lies: Plutarch and Chrysippus on the Uses of Poetry.” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 40: 237–264.

Blundell, Mary W. 1990. “Parental Nature and Stoic Οἰκείωσις.” *Ancient Philosophy* 10: 221–42.

Bobonich, Christopher. 2002. *Plato’s Utopia Recast*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---, ed. 2010. *Plato’s* Laws*: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2010a. “Images of Irrationality.” In Bobonich 2010, 149–71.

Bonazzi, Mauro. 2012a. “Plutarch on the Difference between the Pyrrhonists and the Academics.” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 43: 271–98.

---. 2012b. “*Theoria* and *Praxis*: On Plutarch’s Platonism.” In Bénatouïl and Bonazzi 2012, 139–61.

---. 2014. “Plutarch and the Skeptics.” In Beck 2014, 121–34.

Bonazzi, Mauro and Jan Opsomer, edd. 2009. *The Origins of the Platonic System: Platonisms of the Early Empire and Their Philosophical Contexts*. Namur: Société des Études Classiques.

Boulogne, Jacques. 1996. "Plutarque et la médicine." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 37 (3): 2762–92.

Boys-Stones, George. 1996. "Plutarch, *De Stoicorum Repugnantiis* 1048DE." *The Classical Quarterly* 46 (2): 591–5.

---. 1997a. "Plutarch on the Probable Principle of Cold: Epistemology and the *De Primo Frigido*." *The Classical Quarterly* 47 (1): 227–38.

---. 1997b. "Thyrsus-bearer of the Academy or Enthusiast for Plato? Plutarch's *de Stoicorum repugnantiis*." In Mossman 1997, 41–58.

---. 2001. *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy: A Study of Its Development from the Stoics to Origen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2013. "The *Consolatio ad Apollonium*: Therapy for the Dead." In *Greek and Roman Consolations: Eight Studies of a Tradition and its Afterlife*, edited by Han Baltussen, 123–37. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

---. 2014. "Unity and the Good: Platonists against οἰκείωσις." In *Unité et origine des vertus dans la philosophie ancienne*, edited by Bernard Colette-Dučić and Sylvain Delcomminette, 297–320. Brussels: Ousia.

---. 2017. *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250: An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bradley, Ben. 2006. "Two Conceptions of Intrinsic Value." *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 9: 111–30.

Brenk, Frederick E. 1988. "Plutarch's *Erotikos*: The Drag Down Pulled Up." *Illinois Classical Studies* 13: 457–71.

---. 2000. "All for Love: The Rhetoric of Exaggeration in Plutarch's *Erotikos*." In Van der Stockt 2000, 45–60.

---. 2012. "Plutarch and 'Pagan Monotheism'." In Roig Lanzillotta and Muñoz Gallarte 2012, 73–84.

Brennan, Tad. 1998. "The Old Stoic Theory of Emotions." In Sihvola and Engberg-Pedersen 1998, 21–70.

---. 2012. "The Nature of the Spirited Part of the Soul and Its Object." In Barney, Brennan, and Brittain 2012, 102–27.

Brink, Charles O. 1955. "Οἰκείωσις and οἰκειότης: Theophrastus and Zeno on Nature in Moral Theory." *Phronesis* 1: 123–45.

Brittain, Charles. 2001. *Philo of Larissa: The Last of the Academic Sceptics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Broadie, Sarah and Christopher Rowe, edd. 2002. *Aristotle,* Nicomachean Ethics*: Translation and Historical Introduction by Christopher Rowe and Philosophical Introduction and Commentary by Sarah Broadie*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brogaard, Berit. 2014. "Seeing as a Non-Experiential Mental State: The Case from Synesthesia and Visual Imagery." In *Consciousness Inside and Out: Phenomenology, Neuroscience, and the Nature of Experience*, edited by Richard Brown, 377–94. New York: Springer.

Brown, Eric. 2012. "The Unity of Soul in Plato's *Republic*." In Barney, Brennan, and Brittain 2012, 53–73.

Brunschwig, Jacques. 1986. "The Cradle Argument in Epicureanism and Stoicism." In Schofield and Striker 1986, 113–44.

Burkert, Walter. 1972. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*. Translated by Edwin L. Minar. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burnet, John. 1900. *The Ethics of Aristotle*. London: Methuen and Co.

Burnyeat, Myles F. 1980. "Aristotle on Learning to be Good." In Rorty 1980, 69–92.

---. 1999. "Culture and Society in Plato's *Republic*." In *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, edited by Grethe B. Peterson, 215–324. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

---. 2006. "The Truth of Tripartition." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 106: 1–22.

Cairns, Douglas A. 1993. Aidōs*: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Campbell, Keith. 1985. "Self-Mastery and Stoic Ethics." *Philosophy* 60 (233): 327–40.

Carey, Christopher. 1996. "Rhetorical Means of Persuasion." In Rorty 1996, 399–415.

Carone, Gabriela R. 2002. "Pleasure, Virtue, Externals, and Happiness in Plato's *Laws*." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 19 (4): 327–44.

---. 2004. "Calculating Machines or Leaky Jars? The Moral Psychology of Plato's *Gorgias*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 26: 55–96.

Carpenter, Amber D. 2010. "Emodied Intelligent (?) Souls: Plants in Plato's *Timaeus*." *Phronesis* 55: 281–303.

Castelnérac, Benoît. 2007. "Plutarch's Psychology of Moral Virtue." *Ancient Philosophy* 27 (1): 141–63.

Caston, Victor M. 1996. "Why Aristotle Needs Imagination." *Phronesis* 41 (1): 20–55.

---. 1998. "Aristotle and the Problem of Intentionality." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 58: 249–98.

---. 1999. "Aristotle's Two Intellects: A Modest Proposal." *Phronesis* 44 (3): 199–227.

---. 2006. "Aristotle's Psychology." In *The Blackwell Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, edited by M. L. Gill and P. Pellegrin, 316–46. Oxford: Blackwell.

---. 2011. “Aristotle on Perceptual Content.” Presented in the Seminar on Aristotle’s Philosophy of Mind, University of Michigan, Fall 2011, October.

Centrone, Bruno. 1990. *Pseudopythagorica Ethica. I Trattati Morali di Archita, Metapo, Teage, Eurifamo*. Naples: Bibliopolis.

---. 2000. “Platonism and Pythagoreanism in the Early Empire.” In *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, edited by Christopher Rowe and Malcolm Schofield, 559–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, John M. 1989. “Greek Philosophers on Euthanasia and Suicide.” In *Suicide and Euthanasia: Historical and Contemporary Themes*, edited by Baruch A. Brody, 9–39. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

---. 1996. “An Aristotelian Theory of the Emotions.” In Rorty 1996, 238–57.

---, ed. 1997. “Plato’s *Republic*.” In *Plato: Complete Works*. Translated by G. M. A. Grube and C. D. C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

---, ed. 1999. *Reason and Emotion: Essays on Ancient Moral Psychology and Ethical Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 1999a. “Plato’s Theory of Human Good in the *Philebus*.” In Cooper 1999, 151–64. (repr. of *Id*. 1977. *The Journal of Philosophy* 74: 713–30.)

---. 1999b. “Plato’s Theory of Human Motivation.” In Cooper 1999, 118–37. (repr. of *Id*. 1984. *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 1: 3–21.)

---. 1999c. “Some Remarks on Aristotle’s Moral Psychology.” In Cooper 1999, 237–50. (repr. of *Id*. 1988. *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 27, Supplemental: 25–42.)

---. 1999d. “The *Magna Moralia* and Aristotle’s Moral Psychology.” In Cooper 1999, 195–211. (repr. of *Id*. 1973. *American Journal of Philology* 94: 327–49.)

Cooper, Laurence D. 2008. *Eros in Plato, Rousseau, and Nietzsche: The Politics of Infinity*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Cornford, Francis M. 1950. “The Doctrine of Eros in Plato’s *Symposium*.” In *The Unwritten Philosophy and Other Essays*, edited by W. K. C. Guthrie, 68–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corti, Aurora. 2014. *L’*Adversus Colotem *di Plutarco: storia di una polemica filosofica*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Cotton, Anne. 2010. “Gardener of Souls: Philosophical Education in Plato’s *Phaedrus*.” In *Gardening Philosophy for Everyone: Cultivating Wisdom*, edited by Daniel O’Brien, 232–44. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Crawford, Matthew B. 1999. “*Amatorius*: Plutarch’s Platonic Departure from *Peri Gamou* Literature.” In Pérez Jiménez, García Lopez, and Aguilar 1999, 287–97.

Crombie, I. M. 1963. *An Examination of Plato’s Doctrines. Vol. II: Plato on Knowledge and Reality*. New York: Humanities Press.

Cross, R. C. and Woozley, A. D. 1964. *Plato's* Republic*: A Philosophical Commentary*. London: Macmillan.

Curzer, Howard J. 2012. *Aristotle and the Virtues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Deonna, Julien A., Raffaele Rodogno, and Fabrice Teroni. 2012. *In Defense of Shame: The Faces of an Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dihle, Albrecht. 1956. *Studien zur griechischen Biographie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Dik, Helma. 2014. "'Most likely to succeed': Degree Adverbs Specifying Probability in Classical Greek." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 54: 599–616.

Dillon, John M. 1977. *The Middle Platonists, 80 BC to AD 220*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

---. 1983. "*Metriopatheia* and *Apatheia*: Some Reflections on a Controversy in Later Greek Ethics." In *Essays in Ancient Greek Philosophy II*, edited by John P. Anton and Anthony Preus, 508–17. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

---. 1988a. "'Orthodoxy' and 'Eclecticism': Middle Platonists and Neo-Pythagoreans." In Dillon and Long 1988, 103–25.

---. 1988b. "Plutarch and Platonist Orthodoxy." *Illinois Classical Studies* 13 (2): 357–64.

---. 1993. *Alcinous,* The Handbook of Platonism*: Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1999. "Plutarch's Debt to Xenocrates." In Pérez Jiménez, García Lopez, and Aguilar 1999, 305–11.

---. 2001a. "Plutarch and god: Theodicy and Cosmogony in the Thought of Plutarch." In *Traditions of Theology: Studies in Hellenistic Theology, its Background and Aftermath*, edited by Dorothea Frede and André Laks, 223–37. Leiden: Brill.

---. 2001b. "Plutarch and the Separable Intellect." In *Estudios sobre Plutarco: Misticismo y Religiones Mistéricas en la obra de Plutarco*, edited by Francesc Casadesús Bordoy and Aurelio Pérez Jiménez, 35–44. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.

---. 2003. *The Heirs of Plato: A Study of the Old Academy, 347–274 B.C*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2010a. "Dion and Brutus: Philosopher Kings Adrift in a Hostile World." In *Plutarch's* Lives*: Parellelism and Purpose*, edited by Noreen Humble, 87–102. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

---. 2010b. "Pythagoreanism in Plutarch." In *Plutarch: On the* Daimonion *of Socrates: Human Liberation, Divine Guidance and Philosophy. Introduction, Text, Translation and Interpretive Essays*, edited by Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, 139–44. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

---. 2013. “Plotinus and the Vehicle of the Soul.” In *Gnosticism, Platonism and the Late Ancient World: Essays in Honour of John D. Turner*, edited by Kevin Corrigan and Rasimus Tuomas, 485–96. Leiden: Brill.

---. 2016. “Plutarch the Philosopher and Plutarch the Historian on *Apatheia*.” In Opsomer, Roskam, and Titchener 2016, 9–15.

Dillon, John M. and Anthony A. Long, edd. 1988. *The Question of “Eclecticism”: Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dirlmeier, Franz. 1983. *Aristoteles,* Nikomachische Ethik. *Übersetzt und kommentiert von Franz Dirlmeier*. 2nd edn. (1st edn. 1956). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Dominick, Yancy H. 2006. “Teaching Nature: Natural Virtue and Practical Wisdom in the *Nicomachean Ethics*.” *The Journal of the Southwestern Philosophical Society* 22 (1): 103–11.

Donini, Pier Luigi. 1974. *Tre studi sull’aristotelismo nel II secolo d. C*. Torino: G. B. Paravia.

---. 1986. “Plutarco, Ammonio e l’Academia.” In *Miscellanea Plutarchea: Atti del I Convegno di Studi su Plutarco (Roma, 23 novembre 1985)*, edited by Frederick E. Brenk and Italo Gallo, 97–110. Ferrara: Giornale filologico Ferrarese.

---. 1988. “The History of the Concept of Eclecticism.” In Dillon and Long 1988, 15–33.

---. 1999. “Platone e Aristotele nella tradizione pitagorica secondo Plutarco.” In Pérez Jiménez, García Lopez, and Aguilar 1999, 9–24.

---. 2011. “L’eredità academica e i fondamenti del platonismo in Plutarco.” In *Commentary and Tradition: Aristotelianism, Platonism, and Post-Hellenistic Philosophy*, edited by Mauro Bonazzi, 375–402. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Dorter, Kenneth. 2006. *The Transformation of Plato’s* Republic. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Dow, Jamie. 2015. *Passions and Persuasion in Aristotle’s* Rhetoric. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doyle, Daniel. 2012. “Preservative Οἰκείωσις: Its Constitution and Consciousness.” In *Oikeiosis and the Natural Basis of Morality: From Classical Stoicism to Modern Philosophy*, edited by Ana M. González and Alejandro G. Vigo, 37–66. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

DuBois, Edward C. 2014. “Does Happiness Die with us? An Aristotelian Examination of the Fortunes of the Deceased.” *Journal of Philosophy of Life* 4 (1): 28–37.

Duff, Timothy. 1999. *Plutarch’s Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2008. “Models of Education in Plutarch.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 128: 1–26.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. 1986. “Discovering the Good: *Oikeiōsis* and *Kathēkonta* in Stoic Ethics.” In Schofield and Striker 1986, 145–83.

---. 1998. “Marcus Aurelius on Emotions.” In Sihvola and Engberg-Pedersen 1998, 305–37.

Erbse, Hartmut, ed. 1969. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Erginel, Mehmet M. 2013. "How Smart is the Appetitive Part of the Soul?" In *Dialogues on Plato's* Politeia *(*Republic*): Selected Papers of the Ninth Symposium Platonicum*, edited by Noburu Notomi and Luc Brisson, 204–8. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.

---. Forthcoming. "Chapter 5: Are the Parts of the Soul Agent-Like?"

Etheridge, Sanford G. 1961. "Plutarch's *De Virtute Morali*: A Study in Extra-Peripatetic Aristotelianism." PhD diss., Harvard University.

Evans, Matthew. 2008. "Plato on the Possibility of Hedonic Mistakes." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 35: 89–124.

Ferguson, Tamara J., Daniel Brugman, Jennifer White, and Heidi L. Eyre. 2007. "Shame and Guilt as Morally Warranted Experiences." In Tracy, Robins, and Tangney 2007, 330–51.

Ferrari, Franco. 1995. *Dio, idee, materia. La struttura del cosmo in Plutarco di Cheronea*. Naples: D'Auria.

---. 2008. "Moderatismo etico e controllo delle passioni in Plutarco." In *Le emozioni secondo i filosofi antichi: Atti del Convegno Nazionale (Siracusa 10–11 maggio 2007)*, edited by Giovanna R. Giardina and Maria di Pasquale Barbanti, 135–62. Catania: Cooperativa Universitaria Editrice Catanese di Magistero.

Ferrari, G. R. F. 1991. "Moral Fecundity: A Discussion of A. W. Price, *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 9: 169–84.

Festugière, André J. 1950 (repr. 1973). *Contemplation et vie contemplative selon Platon*. Paris: Vrin.

Fialho, Maria do Céu Zambujo. 2007. "Φιλανθρωπία and φιλαυτία in Plutarch's *Theseus*." *Hermathena* 182: 71–83.

Finamore, John. 1985. *Iamblichus and the Theory of the Vehicle of the Soul*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Fitzgerald, John T., ed. 2008. *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*. New York: Routledge.

---. 2008a. "The Passions and Moral Progress: an Introduction." In Fitzgerald 2008, 1–26.

Flacelière, Robert. 1964. *Sagesse de Plutarque*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Fortenbaugh, William W. 1975. *Aristotle on Emotion: A Contribution to Philosophical Psychology, Rhetoric, Poetics, Politics and Ethics*. New York: Harper and Row.

---, ed. 1983. *On Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics: The Works of Arius Didymus*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

---. 2006. *Aristotle's Practical Side: On his Psychology, Ethics, Politics and Rhetoric*. Leiden: Brill.

---. 2008. "Aristotle and Theophrastus on the Emotions." In Fitzgerald 2008, 29–47.

Frazier, Françoise. 2008. “Éros, Arès et Aphrodite dans l’*Érotikos*: Une reconsidération de la réponse à Pemptidès (ch. 13–14).” In *Philosophy in Society: Virtues and Values in Plutarch*, edited by Maria do Céu Zambujo Fialho, 117–35. Coimbra: Coimbra University Press.

Frede, Dorothea. 2010. “Puppets on Strings: Moral Psychology in *Laws* Books 1 and 2.” In Bobonich 2010, 108–26.

Frede, Michael. 1986. “The Stoic Doctrine of the Affections of the Soul.” In Schofield and Striker 1986, 93–110.

---. 1987. “Numenius.” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 36 (2): 1034–75.

---. 1999. “On the Stoic Conception of the Good.” In *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*, edited by Katerina Ierodiakonou, 71–94. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gallo, Italo, ed. 1992. *Plutarco e le Scienze: Atti del IV Convengo Plutarcheo (Genova-Bocca di Magra, 22–25 aprile 1991)*. Genova: Sagep.

Gauthier, René A., and Jean Y. Jolif. 1958–9. *Aristoteles: L’*Éthique à Nicomaque*. Introduction, Traduction et Commentaire*. 2 vols. Paris: Éditions Béatrice-Nauwelaerts.

Gerson, Lloyd P. 1994. *God and Greek Philosophy: Studies in the Early History of Natural Theology*. London: Routledge.

Gill, Christopher. 1983a. “Did Chrysippus Understand Medea?” *Phronesis* 28: 136–49.

---. 1983b. “The Question of Character Development: Plutarch and Tacitus.” *The Classical Quarterly* 33: 469–87.

---. 1985. “Plato and the Education of Character.” *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 67 (1): 1–26.

---. 2006. *The Structured Self in Hellenistic and Roman Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2016. “Antiochus’s Theory of *Oikeōsis*.” In *Cicero’s* De Finibus*: Philosophical Approaches*, edited by Julia Annas and Gábor Betegh, 221–47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glibert-Thirry, Anne, ed. 1977. *Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes* Περὶ παθῶν. *Édition critique du texte grec et de la traduction latine médiévale*. Leiden: Brill.

Glucker, John. 1978. *Antiochus and the Late Academy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Goldhill, Simon. 2002. *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gooch, Paul W. 1983. “Aristotle and the Happy Dead.” *Classical Philology* 78 (2): 112–16.

Görgemanns, Herwig. 1983. “*Oikeiōsis* in Arius Didymus.” In Fortenbaugh 1983, 165–89.

Gosling, Justin C. 1973. *Plato*. London: Routledge.

Gould, Thomas. 1963. *Platonic Love*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Gourinat, Jean-Baptiste. 2007. "*Akrasia* and *Enkrateia* in Ancient Stoicism: Minor Vice and Minor Virtue?" In Akrasia *in Greek Philosophy: From Socrates to Plotinus*, edited by Christopher Bobonich and Pierre Destrée, 215–47. Leiden: Brill.

Graver, Margaret. 2002. *Cicero on the Emotions:* Tusculan Disputations *3 and 4*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

---. 2007. *Stoicism and Emotion*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Gronau, Karl. 1914. *Poseidonios und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegese*. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner.

Hackforth, Reginald. 1936. "Plato's Theism." *The Classical Quarterly* 30 (1): 4–9.

Hadot, Pierre. 1995. *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Edited by Arnold I. Davidson. Translated by John Michael Chase. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hahm, David E. 1977. *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press.

Håland, Evy J. 2011. "Women, Death and the Body in Some of Plutarch's Writings." *Mediterranean Review* 4 (2): 1–48.

Hani, Jean, ed. and trans. 2003. "Plutarque, *Consolation à Apollonios*." In *Plutarque,* Oeuvres Morales*, vol. II*. 2nd edn. (1st edn. 1985). Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Harris, William. 2001. *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hawley, Richard. 1999. "Practicing What You Preach: Plutarch's Sources and Treatment." In Pomeroy 1999, 116–27.

Helmig, Christoph. 2005. "Die Weltentstehung des *Timaios* und die platonische ὁμοίωσις θεῷ. Zum kosmologischen Hintergrund von Plutarch, *De sera numinis vindicta* 550 D–E." In *Platons* Timaios *als Grundtext der Kosmologie in Spätantike, Mittelalter und Renaissance*, edited by Thomas Leinkauf and Carlos Steel, 13–40. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Hershbell, Jackson P. 1984. "Plutarch's Pythagorean Friends." *The Classical Bulletin* 60 (4): 73–9.

---. 1992. "Plutarch and the Stoics." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 36 (5): 3336–52.

Hertzoff, Andrew. 2008. "Eros and Moderation in Plutarch's *Life of Solon*." *The Review of Politics* 70 (3): 339–69.

Hirsch-Luipold, Rainer, ed. 2005. *Gott und die Götter bei Plutarch: Götterbilder—Gottesbilder—Weltbilder*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hirzel, Rudolf. 1912. *Plutarch*. Toronto: University of Toronto Libraries.

Horky, Phillip Sidney. 2013. *Plato and Pythagoreanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobbs, Angela. 2000. *Plato and the Hero: Courage, Manliness and the Impersonal Good*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horowitz, Maryanne C. 1998. *Seeds of Virtue and Knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hume, David. 2000. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Edited by David F. Norton and Mary J. Norton. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ingenkamp, Heinz Gerd. 1971. *Plutarchs Schriften über die Heilung der Seele*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

---. 1999. "*De Virtute Morali*: Plutarchs Scheingefecht gegen die stoische Lehre von der Seele." In Pérez Jiménez, García Lopez, and Aguilar 1999, 79–94.

---. 2000. "Rhetorische und philosophische Mittel der Seelenheilung; Ein Vergleich zwischen Ciceros *Tusculaner Disputationen* und Plutarchs Seelenheilungsschriften." In Van der Stockt 2000, 251–66.

Inwood, Brad. 1983. "Comments on Professor Görgemann's Paper: The Two Forms of *Oikeiosis* in Arius Didymus and the Stoa." In Fortenbaugh 1983, 190–201.

---. 1984. "Hierocles: Theory and Arguments in the Second Century A.D." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 2: 151–83.

---. 1985. *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1986. "Goal and Target in Stoicism." *Journal of Philosophy* 83 (10): 547–56.

---. 2014. *Ethics After Aristotle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Inwood, Brad, and Pier Luigi Donini. 1999. "Stoic Ethics." In *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, edited by Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld, and Malcolm Schofield, 675–738. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Irwin, Terence H. 1977. *Plato's Moral Theory: The Early and Middle Dialogues*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---. 1995. *Plato's Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1998. "Stoic Inhumanity." In Sihvola and Engberg-Pedersen 1998, 219–41.

---, ed. and trans. 1999. *Nicomachean Ethics*. 2nd edn. (1st edn. 1985). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

---. 2011. "Beauty and Morality in Aristotle." In Miller 2011, 239–53.

Janko, Richard. 2011. *Philodemus,* On Poems *III–IV, with the Fragments of Aristotle,* On Poets. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, Michelle. 2015. "Early Education in Plato's *Republic*." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 23 (5): 843–63.

Jimenez, Marta. 2015. "Aristotle on 'Steering the Young by Pleasure and Pain'." *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 29 (2): 137–64.

Johansen, Thomas. 2000. "Body, Soul, and Tripartition in Plato's *Timaeus*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 19: 87–111.

Johnstone, Mark A. 2006. "Hylomorphism." *The Journal of Philosophy* 103 (12): 652–98.

Jones, Christopher P. 1966. "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works." *Journal of Roman Studies* 56: 61–74.

---. 1967. "The Teacher of Plutarch." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 71: 205–13.

---. 1971. *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, Roger M. 1916. *The Platonism of Plutarch*. Menasha, WI: George Banta Publishing Company.

---. 1926. "The Ideas as the Thoughts of God." *Classical Philology* 21: 317–26.

Kahn, Charles. 1987. "Plato's Theory of Desire." *The Review of Metaphysics* 41 (1): 77–103.

Kamtekar, Rachana. 1998. "Imperfect Virtue." *Ancient Philosophy* 18: 315–39.

---. 2004. "Situationism and Virtue Ethics on the Content of our Character." *Ethics* 114 (3): 458–91.

---. 2006. "Speaking with the Same Voice as Reason: Personification in Plato's Psychology." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 31: 167–202.

---. 2010. "Psychology and the Inculcation of Virtue in Plato's *Laws*." In Bobonich 2010, 127–48.

Karamanolis, George E. 2006. *Plato and Aristotle in Agreement? Platonists on Aristotle from Antiochus to Porphyry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2013. *The Philosophy of Early Christianity*. Durham: Acumen.

---. 2014. "Plutarch." *SEP*. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plutarch/.

Kechagia, Eleni. 2011. *Plutarch Against Colotes: A Lesson in History of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kennedy, George. 1963. *The Arts of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kenny, Anthony. 1978. *The Aristotelian Ethics. A Study of the Relationship between the* Eudemian *and* Nicomachean Ethics *of Aristotle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kim, Jinyo. 2000. *The Pity of Achilles: Oral Style and the Unity of the* Iliad. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

King, Margaret. 2000. "Commemoration of Infants on Roman Funerary Inscriptions." In *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*, edited by Graham J. Oliver, 117–54. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Kinneavy, James L. 1986. "*Kairos*: A Neglected Concept in Classical Rhetoric. In *Rhetoric and* Praxis*: The Contribution of Classical Rhetoric to Practical Reasoning*, edited Jean. D. Moss, 79–105. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Klein, Jacob. 2016. "The Stoic Argument from *Oikeiōsis*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 50: 143–200.

Klosko, George. 1993. "Persuasion and Moral Reform in Plato and Aristotle." *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 47 (184): 31–49.

Knuuttila, Simo, and Juha Sihvola. 1998. "How the Philosophical Analysis of the Emotions was Introduced." In Sihvola and Engberg-Pedersen 1998, 1–20.

Kolodny, Niko. 2003. "Love as a Valuing Relationship." *The Philosophical Review* 112 (2): 135–89.

Konstan, David. 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Korsgaard, Christine M. 1998. "Motivation, Metaphysics, and the Value of the Self: A Reply to Ginsborg, Guyer, and Schneewind." *Ethics* 109: 49–66.

Kraut, Richard. 1989. *Aristotle on the Human Good*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 2012. "Aristotle on Becoming Good: Habituation, Reflection, and Perception." In *The Oxford Handbook of Aristotle*, edited by Christopher Shields. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krentz, Edgar M. 2008. "Πάθη and Ἀπάθεια in Early Roman Empire Stoics." In Fitzgerald 2008, 122–35.

Laks, André. Forthcoming. "How Preplatonic Worlds Became Ensouled." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 55: 1–34.

Laks, André, and Glenn W. Most, edd. 2016. *Early Greek Philosophy. Vol. IV: Western Greek Thinkers, Part 1*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Le Corsu, France. 1981. *Plutarque et les femmes dans les* Vies Parallèles. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Leighton, Stephen R. 1996. "Aristotle and the Emotions." In Rorty 1996, 206–37.

Lesses, Glenn. 1993. "Austere Friends: The Stoics and Friendship." *Apeiron* 26 (1): 57–75.

Liebert, Hugh. 2016. *Plutarch's Politics: Between City and Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lilla, Salvatore R. C. 1971. *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lindsay-Hartz, Janice, Joseph De Rivera, and Michael F. Mascolo. 1995. "Differentiating Guilt and Shame and Their Effects on Motivation." In *Self-Conscious Emotions: The Psychology of Shame, Guilt, Embarrassment, and Pride*, edited by June P. Tangney and Kurt W. Fischer, 274–300. New York: The Guilford Press.

Long, Anthony A. 1967. "Carneades and the Stoic *telos*." *Phronesis* 12: 59–90.

---. 1968a. “Aristotle’s Legacy to Stoic Ethics.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 15: 72–85.

---. 1968b. “The Stoic Concept of Evil.” *The Philosophical Quarterly* 18: 329–43.

---, ed. 1971. *Problems in Stoicism*. London: Athlone.

---. 1971a. “Freedom and Determinism in the Stoic Theory of Human Action.” In Long 1971, 173–99.

---, ed. 1996. *Stoic Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1996a. “Greek Ethics after MacIntyre and the Stoic Community of Reason.” In Long 1996, 156–78. (repr. of *Id*. 1983. *Ancient Philosophy* 3: 184–97.)

---. 1996b. “Stoic Eudaimonism.” In Long 1996, 179–201. (repr. of *Id*. 1989. *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy* 4: 77–101.)

Long, Anthony A., and David N. Sedley. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. *Volume 1: Translations of the Principal Sources, with Philosophical Commentary*. *Volume 2: Greek and Latin Texts with Notes and Bibliography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lord, Carnes. 1982. *Education and Culture in the Political Thought of Aristotle*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lorenz, Hendrik. 2006. *The Brute Within: Appetitive Desire in Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2012. “The Cognition of Appetite in Plato’s *Timeaus*.” In Barney, Brennan, and Brittain 2012, 238–58.

Lucchesi, Michele A. 2013. “Love Theory and Political Practice in Plutarch: The *Amatorius* and the *Lives of Coriolanus and Alcibiades*.” In *Erôs in Ancient Greece*, edited by Ed Sanders, 209–27. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lutz, Catherine A. 1988. *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll and Their Challenge to Western Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lycos, Kimon. 1964. “Aristotle and Plato on ‘Appearing’.” *Mind* 73 (292): 496–514.

Machek, David. 2018. “Carving, Taming or Gardening? Plutarch on Emotions, Reason and Virtue.” *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 26 (2): 255–75.

Mahoney, Timothy A. 2004. “Is Assimilation to God in the *Theaetetus* purely Otherworldly?” *Ancient Philosophy* 24 (2): 321–38.

---. 2005. “Moral Virtue and Assimilation to God in the *Timaeus*.” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 28: 77–91.

Malherbe, Abraham J. 2014. “Medical Imagery in the Pastoral Epistles.” In *Light from the Gentiles: Hellenistic Philosophy and Early Christianity*. *Collected Essays, 1959–2012, by Abraham J. Malherbe*, edited by Carl R. Holladay, John T. Fitzgerald, Gregory E. Sterling, and James W. Thompson, 117–34. Leiden: Brill.

Mansini, Guy. 1998. "Aristotle on Needing Friends." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 72 (3): 405–17.

Marrou, Henri I. 1956. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. London: Sheed and Ward.

Martin, Hubert M. 1960. "The Concept of *Prāotēs* in Plutarch's *Lives*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 3: 65–73.

---. 1961. "The Concept of *Philanthropia* in Plutarch's *Lives*." *The American Journal of Philology* 82 (2): 164–75.

McInerney, Jeremy. 2003. "Plutarch's Manly Women." In Andreia*: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, edited by Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter, 319–44. Leiden: Brill.

Meeusen, Michiel, ed. 2017. *Plutarch's Science of Natural Problems: A Study with Commentary on* Quaestiones Naturales. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Meeusen, Michiel and Luc Van der Stockt, edd. 2015. *Natural Spectaculars: Aspects of Plutarch's Philosophy of Nature*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Menn, Stephen. 1992. "Aristotle and Plato on God as *Nous* and as the Good." *Review of Metaphysics* 45 (3): 543–73.

---. 1995. *Plato on God as* Nous. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Merki, Hubert. 1952. *Ὁμοίωσις Θεῷ: Von der platonischen Angleichung an Gott zur Gottähnlichkeit bei Gregor von Nyssa*. Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusverlag.

Meyer, Susan S., ed. and trans. 2015. *Plato:* Laws *1 and 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, Jon, ed. 2011. *Aristotle's* Nicomachean Ethics*: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moline, Jon N. 1978. "Plato on the Complexity of the Psyche." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 60: 1–26.

---. 1981. *Plato's Theory of Understanding*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Monoson, Susan Sara. 1998. "Remembering Pericles: The Political and Theoretical Import of Plato's *Menexenus*." *Political Theory* 26 (4): 489–513.

Moravcsik, Julius M. E. 2001. "Inner Harmony and the Human Ideal in *Republic* IV and IX." *The Journal of Ethics* 5: 39–56.

Morgan, Theresa. 2007. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moss, Jessica. 2005. "Shame, Pleasure, and the Divided Soul." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 29: 137–70.

---. 2012a. *Aristotle on the Apparent Good*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2012b. “Pictures and Passions in the *Timaeus* and *Philebus*.” In Barney, Brennan, and Brittain 2012, 259–80.

Mossman, Judith M., ed. 1997. *Plutarch and His Intellectual World: Essays on Plutarch*. London: Duckworth.

---. 1999. “Is the Pen Mightier than the Sword? The Failure of Rhetoric in Plutarch’s *Demosthenes*.” *Histos* 3: 77–101.

Moxnes, Halvor. 1997. “Conventional Values in the Hellenistic World: ‘Masculinity’.” In *Conventional Values of the Hellenistic Greeks*, edited by Per Bilde, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Lise Hannestad, and Jan Zahle, 263–84. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Murray, Miles. 2001. “Plato on Suicide (*Phaedo* 60C–63C).” *Classical Association of Canada* 55 (3): 244–58.

Musielak, Maria. 2011. “Friendship in the Works of Plutarch.” In *Studia Lesco Mrozewicz ab amicis et discipulis dedicata*, edited by Sebastian Ruciński, 255–64. Poznań: Instytut Historii UAM.

Nehamas, Alexander. 1982. “Plato on Imitation and Poetry in *Republic* 10.” In *Plato on Beauty, Wisdom, and the Arts*, edited by Julius M. E. Moravcsik and Philip Temko, 47–78. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.

Németh, Attila. 2017. *Epicurus on Self*. New York: Routledge.

Neschke-Hentschke, Ada. 1995. *Platonisme politique et théorie du droit naturel. Contributions à une archéologie de la culture politique européene. Volume 1: Le platonisme politique dans l’antiquité*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers.

Neumayr, John. 1963. “Plutarch, Aristotle, and the Nature of Poetry (I).” *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 19 (2): 305–34.

---. 1964. “Plutarch, Aristotle, and the Nature of Poetry (II).” *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 20 (1): 106–31.

Nikolaidis, Anastasios G. 1991. “Plutarch’s Contradictions.” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 42: 164–7.

---. 1997. “Plutarch on Women and Marriage.” *Wiener Studien* 110: 27–88.

---, ed. 2008. *The Unity of Plutarch’s Work:* Moralia *Themes in the* Lives*, Features of the* Lives *in the* Moralia. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Nuchelmans, Gabriel. 1973. *Theories of the Proposition: Ancient and Medieval Conceptions of the Bearers of Truth and Falsity*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 1986 (rev. edn. 2001). *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1994. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 1996. “Aristotle on Emotions and Rational Persuasion.” In Rorty 1996, 303–23.

---. 2001. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nygren, Anders. 1969. *Agape and Eros*. Translated by Philip S. Watson. New York: Harper and Row.

O'Brien, Carl Séan. 2015. *The Demiurge in Ancient Thought: Secondary Gods and Divine Mediators*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oele, Marjolein. 2012. "Passive Dispositions: On the Relationship between πάθος and ἕξις in Aristotle." *Ancient Philosophy* 32: 351–68.

O'Neill, Edward N. 1997. "Plutarch on Friendship." In *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, edited by John T. Fitzgerald, 105–22. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Opsomer, Jan. 1994. "L'Âme du monde et l'âme de l'homme chez Plutarque." In *Estudios sobre Plutarco: Ideas Religiosas: Actas del III Simposio Internacional sobre Plutarco (Oviedo 1992)*, edited by Manuela G. Valdés. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.

---. 1998. *In Search of the Truth: Academic Tendencies in Middle Platonism*. Brussels: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België.

---. 2004. "Plutarch's *De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo*: Manipulation or Search for Consistency." In *Philosophy, Science and Exegesis in Greek, Arabic and Latin Commentaries*, edited by Peter Adamson, Han Baltussen, and Martin W. F. Stone, 137–62. London: Institute of Classical Studies.

---. 2005. "Plutarch's Platonism Revisited." In *L'Eredità Platonica: Studi sul platonismo da Arcesilao a Proclo*, edited by Mauro Bonazzi and Vincenza Celluprica, 161–200. Naples: Bibliopolis.

---. 2006. "Eros in Plutarchs moralischer Psychologie." In *Plutarch: Dialog über die Liebe*, edited by Herwig Görgemanns, 208–35. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

---. 2007a. "Eros and Knowledge in Plutarch's *Amatorius*." In *El Amor en Plutarco: Actas del IX Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Plutarquistas, celebrado en la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de León y en el Museo Romano de Astorga (del 28 al 30 de septiembre de 2006)*, edited by Jesús María Nieto Ibáñez and Raúl López López, 149–69. León: Publicaciones Universidad de León.

---. 2007b. "Plutarch on the One and the Dyad." In Sorabji and Sharples 2007, vol. II, 379–395.

---. 2009. "M. Annius Ammonius, A Philosophical Profile." In Bonazzi and Opsomer 2009, 123–86.

---. 2012. "Plutarch on the Division of the Soul." In Barney, Brennan, and Brittain 2012, 311–30.

---. 2014. "Plutarch and the Stoics." In Beck 2014, 88–103.

Opsomer, Jan, Geert Roskam, and Frances B. Titchener, edd. 2016. *A Versatile Gentleman: Consistency in Plutarch's Writing*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Pakaluk, Michael. 1992. "Commentary on White." *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy* 8 (1): 169–81.

Panagopoulos, Cécile. 1977. "Vocabulaire et mentalité dans les *Moralia* de Plutarque." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 3 (1): 197–235.

Pangle, Lorraine Smith. 2014. *Virtue is Knowledge: The Moral Foundations of Socratic Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pelling, Christopher. 1988. "Aspects of Plutarch's Characterisation." *Illinois Classical Studies* 13 (2): 257–74.

---. 1990. "Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography." In *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, edited by Christopher Pelling, 213–44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2000. "Plutarch's Adaptation of His Source-Material." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100: 127–40.

---. 2011. "What is Popular about Plutarch's 'Popular Philosophy'?" In Roskam and Van der Stockt 2011, 41–58.

---. 2014. "Political Philosophy." In Beck 2014, 149–62.

Pembroke, Simon G. 1971. "*Oikeiōsis*." In Long 1971, 114–49.

Penner, Terence. 1970. "False Anticipatory Pleasures: *Philebus* 36a3–41a6." *Phronesis* 15: 166–78.

---. 1971. "Thought and Desire in Plato." In *Plato II: Ethics, Politics and Philosophy of Art and Religion*, edited by Gregory Vlastos, 96–118. New York: Anchor Books.

---. 1991. "Plato and Davidson: Parts of the Soul and Weakness of Will." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 16, Supplemental: 35–74.

Pérez Jiménez, Aurelio, José García López, and Rosa María Aguilar, edd. 1999. *Plutarco, Platón y Aristóteles: Actas del V Congreso Internacional de la I.P.S. (Madrid-Cuenca, 4–7 de mayo de 1999)*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.

Pinnoy, Maurits. 1973. "Het begrip midden in de ethica van Plutarchs." In *Zetesis: Album amicorum door vrienden en collega's aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. E. de Strycker ter gelegenheid van zijn 65e verjaardag*, edited by Emile de Strycker, 224–33. Antwerp: De Nederlandsche Boekhandel.

Pomeroy, Sarah B., ed. 1999. *Plutarch's* Advice to the Bride and Groom *and* A Consolation to His Wife*: English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Powell, Anton. 2015. "Spartan Education." In *A Companion to Ancient Education*, edited by W. Martin Bloomer, 90–111. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Powers, Nathan. 2012. "The Stoic Argument for the Rationality of the Cosmos." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 43: 245–69.

Preston, Rebecca. 2001. "Roman Questions, Greek Answers: Plutarch and the Construction of Identity." In *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, The Second Sophistic, and The Development of Empire*, edited by Simon Goldhill, 86–119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Price, A. W. 1989. *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---. 1995. *Mental Conflict*. London: Routledge.

---. 2009a. "Are Plato's Soul-Parts Psychological Subjects." *Ancient Philosophy* 29: 1–15.

---. 2009b. "Emotions in Plato and Aristotle." In *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Emotion*, edited by Peter Goldie, 121–42. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pritzl, Kurt. 1983. "Aristotle on Happiness After Death: *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.10–11." *Classical Philology* 78 (2): 101–11.

Puech, Bernadette. 1992. "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 36 (1): 4831–93.

Quilty-Dunn, Jake. 2015. "Believing in Perceiving: Known Illusions and the Classical Dual-Component Theory." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 96: 550–75.

Radice, Roberto. 2000. *"Oikeiosis": ricerche sul fondamento del pensiero stoico e sulla sua genesi*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.

Railton, Peter. 1984. "Alienation, Consequentialism, and the Demands of Morality." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 13 (2): 134–71.

---. 1986. "Facts and Values." *Philosophical Topics* 14 (2): 5–31.

Ramelli, Ilaria. 2009. *Hierocles the Stoic:* Elements of Ethics, *Fragments and Excerpts*. Translated by David Konstan. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Ray, Meghan T. 2010. "Cultivating The Soul: The Ethics of Gardening in Ancient Greece and Rome." In *Gardening Philosophy for Everyone: Cultivating Wisdom*, edited by Daniel O'Brien, 26–37. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Raymond, Christopher. 2017. "Shame and Virtue in Aristotle." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 53: 111–61.

Renaud, François, and Harold Tarrant. 2015. *The Platonic* Alcibiades I*: The Dialogue and its Ancient Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reshotko, Naomi. 2006. *Socratic Virtue: Making the Best of the Neither-Good-Nor-Bad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reydams-Schils, Gretchen J. 2017. "'Becoming Like God' in Platonism and Stoicism." In *From Stoicism to Platonism: The Development of Philosophy, 100 BCE–100CE*, edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen, 142–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rist, John M. 1986. Review of *Scepticism or Platonism? The Philosophy of the Fourth Academy*, by Harold Tarrant. *Phoenix* 40 (4): 467–9.

Rodrigo, Pierre. 2011. "The Dynamic of *Hexis* in Aristotle's Philosophy." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 42 (1): 6–17.

Roig Lanzillotta, Lautaro. 2012. "Plutarch's Idea of God in the Religious and Philosophical Context of Late Antiquity." In Roig Lanzillotta and Muñoz Gallarte 2012, 137–50.

Roig Lanzillotta, Lautaro and Israel Muñoz Gallarte, edd. 2012. *Plutarch in the Religious and Philosophical Discourse of Late Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill.

Rorty, Amélie O., ed. 1980. *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

---, ed. 1996. *Essays on Aristotle's* Rhetoric. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Roskam, Geert. 2002. "A παιδεία for the ruler: Plutarch's Dream of Collaboration between Philosopher and Ruler." In Stadter and Van der Stockt 2002, 175–189.

---. 2004a. "A Note on the Relation between εὐφυία and προκοπή in Ancient Stoicism and (Middle-)Platonism." *Hermes* 132: 232–6.

---. 2004b. "Plutarch on Self and Others." *Ancient Society* 34: 245–73.

---. 2005. *On the Path to Virtue: The Stoic Doctrine of Moral Progress and its Reception in (Middle-)Platonism*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

---. 2011. "Plutarch against Epicurus on Affection for Offspring." In Roskam and Van der Stockt 2011, 175–204.

Roskam, Geert and Luc Van der Stockt, edd. 2011. *Virtues for the People: Aspects of Plutarchan Ethics*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Rowe, Christopher J. 1975. "A Reply to John Cooper on the *Magna Moralia*." *American Journal of Philology* 96: 160–72.

Rozin, Paul, Laura Lowery, and Sumio Imada. 1999. "The CAD Triad Hypothesis: A Mapping Between Three Moral Emotions (Contempt, Anger, Disgust) and Three Moral Codes (Community, Autonomy, Divinity)." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 76 (4): 574–86.

Russell, Daniel C. 2014. "Aristotle on Cultivating Virtue." In *Cultivating Virtue: Perspectives from Philosophy, Theology, and Psychology*, edited by Nancy E. Snow, 17–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Russell, Donald A. 1968. "On Reading Plutarch's *Moralia*." *Greece and Rome* 15: 130–46.

---. 1973. *Plutarch*. London: Duckworth.

---. 1997. "Plutarch, *Amatorius* 13–18." In Mossman 1997, 99–112.

Salles, Ricardo. Forthcoming. "Why is the Cosmos Intelligent? (2) Stoic Cosmology and Plato, *Timaeus* 30a2–c1."

Sandbach, Francis H. 1975. *The Stoics*. London: Chatto and Windus.

---. 1982. "Plutarch and Aristotle." *Illinois Classical Studies* 7 (2): 207–32.

---. 1985. *Aristotle and the Stoics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Santas, Gerasimos X. 1988. *Plato and Freud: Two Theories of Love*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sassi, Maria M. 2011. "Eros as Psychic Energy: Plato and Fluxes of the Soul." In *Inner Life and Soul: Psychē in Plato*, edited by Maurizio Migliori, Linda M. Napolitano Valditara, and Arianna Fermani, 251–65. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.

Saunders, Trevor J. 1972. *Notes on the* Laws *of Plato*. London: University of London Institute of Classical Studies.

Sayre-McCord, Geoffrey. 2008. "Hume on Practical Morality and Inert Reason." In *Oxford Studies in Metaethics*, edited by Russ Schafer-Landau, 299–320. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scheff, Thomas J. 1998. "Therapeutic Alliance: Microanalysis of Shame and the Social Bond." In *Emotions and Psychotherapy: Theory and Research*, edited by William F. Flack Jr. and James D. Laird, 99–113. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schofield, Malcolm and Gisela Striker, edd. 1986. *The Norms of Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sedley, David N. 1997. "'Becoming Like God' in the *Timaeus* and Aristotle." In *Interpreting the "Timaeus"—"Critias"*, edited by Thomas Calvo and Luc Brisson, 327–39. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.

---. 1999. "The Ideal of Godlikeness." In *Plato II: Ethics, Politics, Religion and the Soul*, edited by Gail Fine, 309–28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2004. *The Midwife of Platonism: Text and Subtext in Plato's* Republic. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---. 2012. "The *Theoretikos Bios* in Alcinous." In Bénatouïl and Bonazzi 2012, 163–81.

Sellars, John. 2006. *Stoicism*. London: Routledge.

---. 2007. "Stoic Practical Philosophy in the Imperial Period." In Sorabji and Sharples 2007, vol. I, 115–40.

Sharples, Robert W. 1987. Review of *Scepticism or Platonism?* by Harold Tarrant. *The Philosophical Review* 96 (4): 601–3.

---. 2010. *Peripatetic Philosophy: 200 BC to AD 200: An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sherman, Nancy. 1987. "Aristotle on Friendship and the Shared Life." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 47 (4): 589–613.

---. 1989. *The Fabric of Character*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 1997. *Making a Necessity of Virtue: Aristotle and Kant on Virtue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shields, Christopher. 2001. "Simple Souls." In *Essays on Plato's Psychology*, edited by Ellen Wagner, 137–56. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

---. 2014. “Plato’s Divided Soul.” In *Partitioning the Soul: Debates from Plato to Leibniz*, edited by Dominik Perler and Klaus Corcilius, 15–38. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Shiffman, Mark. 2010. “Erotic Wisdom and the Socratic Vocation in Plutarch’s *Platonic Question* 1.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 50: 243–71.

Shorey, Paul. 1929. “Plato and the Stoic *Oikeiosis* in the Berlin *Theaetetus* Commentary.” *Classical Philology* 24 (4): 409–10.

Sierksma-Atgeres, Suzan. 2015. “‘Say Goodbye to Opinions!’ Plutarch’s Philosophy of Natural Phenomena and the Journey to Metaphysical Knowledge*.” In Meeusen and Van der Stockt 2015, 57–71.

Sihvola, Juha and Troels Engberg-Pedersen, edd. 1998. *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Silverman, Allan. 2010. “Contemplating Divine Mind.” In *Ancient Models of Mind: Studies in Human and Divine Rationality*, edited by Andrea Nightingale, 75–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Singpurwalla, Rachel. 2006. “Plato’s Defense of Justice in the *Republic*.” In *The Blackwell Guide to Plato’s* Republic, edited by Gerasimos X. Santas, 263–82. Oxford: Blackwell.

---. 2010. “The Tripartite Theory of Motivation in Plato’s *Republic*.” *Philosophy Compass* 5 (11): 880–92.

---. 2011. “Soul Division and Mimesis in *Republic* X.” In *Plato and the Poets*, edited by Pierre Destrée and Fritz-Gregor Herrmann, 283–98. Leiden: Brill.

---. 2013. “Why Spirit is the Natural Ally of Reason: Spirit, Reason, and the Fine in Plato’s *Republic*.” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 44: 41–65.

Sirinelli, Jean, ed. and trans. 1987. “Plutarque, *De l’Éducation des enfants*.” In *Plutarque,* Oeuvres morales*, vol. I.1*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Sorabji, Richard. 1973. “VII—Aristotle on the Rôle of Intellect in Virtue.” *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 74: 107–29.

---. 1993. *Animal Minds and Human Morals: The Origins of the Western Debate*. London: Duckworth.

---. 2000. *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---. 2005. *The Philosophy of the Commentators, 200–600 AD: A Sourcebook. Vol 1: Psychology (with Ethics and Religion)*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

---. 2006. *Self: Ancient and Modern Insights about Individuality, Life, and Death*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sorabji, Richard and Robert W. Sharples, edd. 2007. *Greek and Roman Philosophy, 100 BC to 200 AD*. 2 vols. London: Institute of Classical Studies / University of London.

Spanneut, Michael. 1994. "*Apatheia* ancienne." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 36 (7): 4641–717.

Stadter, Philip A. 1989. *A Commentary on Plutarch's* Pericles. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Caroline Press.

Stadter, Philip A. and Luc Van der Stockt, edd. 2002. *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98–117 A.D.)*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Stafford, Emma J. 1999. "Plutarch on Persuasion." In Pomeroy 1999, 162–72.

Stalley, Richard F. 2007. "Persuasion and the Tripartite Soul in Plato's *Republic*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 32: 63–89.

Stavru, Alessandro. 2017. "*Phainesthai* and *Alētheia* in Plato's *Republic*." *Eudia* 11: 1–7.

Stough, Charlotte L. 1987. "Knowledge and Belief: A Discussion of Julia Annas and Jonathan Barnes, *The Modes of Scepticism: Ancient Texts and Modern Interpretations*; and Harold Tarrant, *Scepticism or Platonism? The Philosophy of the Fourth Academy*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 5: 217–34.

Striker, Gisela. 1983. "The Role of *Oikeiosis* in Stoic Ethics." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 1: 145–67.

---. 1991. "Following Nature: A Study in Stoic Ethics." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 9: 1–73.

Swain, Simon. 1989. "Character Change in Plutarch." *Phoenix* 43: 62–8.

---. 1990a. "Hellenic Culture and the Roman Heroes of Plutarch." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 110: 126–45.

---. 1990b. "Plutarch's *Lives* of Cicero, Cato, and Brutus." *Hermes* 118 (2): 192–203.

Tangney, June P., and Ronda L. Dearing. 2002. *Shame and Guilt*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Tarrant, Harold. 1985. *Scepticism or Platonism? The Philosophy of the Fourth Academy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 2012. "Improvement by Love: From Aeschines to the Old Academy." In *Alcibiades and the Socratic Lover-Educator*, edited by Marguerite Johnson and Harold Tarrant, 147–63. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Taylor, Gabriele. 1985. *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Taylor, Gabriele, and Sybil Wolfram. 1968. "The Self-Regarding and Other-Regarding Virtues." *Philosophical Quarterly* 18 (2): 238–48.

Teloh, Henry. 1976. "Human Nature, Psychic Energy, and Self-Actualization in Plato's *Republic*." *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 14 (3): 345–58.

Teodorsson, Sven-Tage. 1999. "Plutarch and Peripatetic Science." In Pérez Jiménez, García Lopez, and Aguilar 1999, 665–74.

Theander, Carl. 1959. “Plutarchs Forschungen in Rom: Zur mündlichen Überlieferung als Quelle der Biographen.” *Eranos* 57: 99–131.

Thorsrud, Harold. 2010. “Arcesilaus and Carneades.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Scepticism*, edited by Richard Bett, 58–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tigner, Steven S. 2000. “Cultivating Virtue?” *The Journal of Education* 182 (2): 11–18.

Tracy, Jessica L., and Richard W. Robins. 2007. “The Self in Self-Conscious Emotions: A Cognitive Appraisal Approach.” In Tracy, Robins, and Tangney 2007, 3–20.

Tracy, Jessica L., and Richard W. Robins, and June P. Tangney, edd. 2007. *The Self-Conscious Emotions: Theory and Research*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Trapp, Michael B. 2004. “Statesmanship in a Minor Key?” In *The Statesman in Plutarch’s Works. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of the International Plutarch Society (Nijmegen/Castle Hernen, May 1–5, 2002), Vol I: Plutarch’s Statesman and his Aftermath: Political, Philosophical, and Literary Aspects*, edited by Lukas De Blois *et al*., 189–200. Leiden: Brill.

Treu, Maximilian. 1873. *Der sogenannte Lampriaskatalog der Plutarchschriften*. Waldenburg: Programm von Waldenburg.

Tsekourakis, Damianos. 1989. “Die Ursachen von Krankenheiten bei Plutarch.” *Hellenica* 40: 257–69.

Van der Stockt, Luc. 1999. “A Plutarchan Hypomnema on Self-Love.” *American Journal of Philology* 120 (4): 575–99.

---, ed. 2000. *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch: Acta of the 4th International Congress of the International Plutarch Society (Leuven, July 3–6, 1996)*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers.

---. 2011. “*Semper duo, numquam tres*? Plutarch’s *Popularphilosophie* on Friendship and Virtue in *On Having Many Friends*.” In Roskam and Van der Stockt 2011, 19–40.

Van Hoof, Lieve. 2005. “Plutarch’s *De Cohibenda Ira* and its Model Reader.” In *Plutarc a la seva época: paideia i societat: Actas del VIII Simposio Espanol sobre Plutarco (Barcelona, 6–8 de noviembre de 2003)*, edited by Montserrat Jufresa, Francesca Mestre, Pilar Gómez, and Pau Gilabert, 501–6. Barcelona: Sociedad Española de Plutarquistas.

---. 2007. “Strategic Differences: Seneca and Plutarch on Controlling Anger.” *Mnemosyne* 60: 59–86.

---. 2010. *Plutarch’s Practical Ethics: The Social Dynamics of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vander Waerdt, Paul A. 1985a. “Peripatetic Soul-Division, Posidonius, and Middle Platonic Moral Psychology.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 26: 373–94.

---. 1985b. “The Peripatetic Interpretation of Plato’s Tripartite Psychology.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 26: 283–302.

---. 1989. "Colotes and the Epicurean Refutation of Skepticism." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 30 (2): 225–67.

Vasiliou, Iakovos. 2011. "Aristotle, Agents, and Actions." In Miller 2011, 170–90.

---. 2014. "Platonic Virtue: An Alternative Approach." *Philosophy Compass* 9 (9): 605–14.

Vlastos, Gregory. 1981. "The Individual as an Object of Love in Plato." In *Platonic Studies*, edited by Gail Fine, 3–41. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 1991. *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Volpe Cacciatore, Paola and Franco Ferrari, edd. 2007. *Plutarco e la cultura della sua età: Atti del X Convegno Plutarcheo (Fisciano-Paestum, 27–29 ottobre 2005)*. Naples: D'Auria.

von Arnim, Hans, ed. 1906. *Hierokles, Ethische Elementarlehre (Papyrus 9780): Nebst den bei Stobäus erhaltenen ethischen Exzerpten aus Hierokles*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Wachsmuth, Curt. 1863. "Über den katalog der plutarchischen schriften von dem sogenannten Lamprias." *Philologus* 19: 577–8.

Walcot, Peter. 1999. "Plutarch on Women." *Symbolae Osloenses* 74 (1): 163–83.

Warren, James. 2001. "Socratic Suicide." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 121: 91–106.

Watson, Gary. 1975. "Free Agency." *The Journal of Philosophy* 72 (8): 205–20.

Westaway, Katharine M. 1922. *The Educational Theory of Plutarch*. London: University of London Press.

White, L. Michael. 2008. "Moral Pathology: Passions, Progress, and Protreptic in Clement of Alexandria." In Fitzgerald 2008, 284–321.

White, Nicholas P. 1979. "The Basis of Stoic Ethics." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 83: 143–78.

White, Stephen. 1992. "Natural Virtue and Perfect Virtue in Aristotle." *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy* 8 (1): 135–68.

---. 1995. "Cicero among the Therapists." In *Cicero the Philosopher*, edited by G. J. F. Powell, 219–46. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Whittaker, John. 1990. *Alcinoos,* Enseignement des doctrines de Platon*: texte, introduction et commentaire par John Whittaker et traduction par Pierre Louis*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Wilamowitz, Ulrich von. 1923. "Lesefrüchte." *Hermes* 58: 58–86.

Wilberding, James. 2009. "Plato's Two Forms of Second-Best Morality." *Philosophical Review* 118: 351–74.

Wilburn, Joshua. 2013. "Moral Education and the Spirited Part of the Soul in Plato's *Laws*." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 45: 63–102.

---. 2015. "Courage and the Spirited Part of the Soul in Plato's *Republic*." *Philosopher's Index* 15 (26): 1–21.

Wilcox, Andrea. 2006. "Exemplary Grief: Gender and Virtue in Seneca's Consolations to Women." *Helios* 33 (1): 73–105.

Williams, Bernard. 1976. "Moral Luck." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 50, Supplemental: 115–35.

Wilson, Donna. 2002. *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the* Iliad. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Witt, Charlotte. 1989. "Hylomorphism in Aristotle." *Apeiron* 22 (4): 141–58.

Woods, Michael. 1982. *Aristotle,* Eudemian Ethics*: Books I, II, and VIII: Translated with a Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Woolf, Raphael. 2012. "How to See an Unencrusted Soul." In Barney, Brennan, and Brittain 2012, 150–73.

Wright, Richard A. 2008. "Plutarch on Moral Progress." In Fitzgerald 2008, 136–50.

Wyttenbach, Daniel A., ed. 1795–1830. *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia: Opera, Exceptis Vitis, Reliqua*. Vols. 1.1–8.2. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Xenophontos, Sophia. 2016. *Ethical Education in Plutarch*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Yong, Patrick T. M. 1996. "Intellectualism and Moral Habituation in Plato's Earlier Dialogues." *Apeiron* 29 (4): 49–61.

Yunis, Harvey, ed. 2011. *Plato,* Phaedrus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zadorojnyi, Alexei. 2002. "Safe Drugs for the Good Boys: Platonism and Pedagogy in Plutarch's *De audiendis poetis*?" In Stadter and Van der Stockt 2002, 297–330.

Zanker, Graham. 1981. "Enargeia in the Ancient Criticism of Poetry." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 124: 297–311.

Zeller, Eduard. 1868. *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland.

---. 1892. *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*. Translated by Oswald J. Reichel. London: Longmans, Green and Company.

Ziegler, Konrat. 1949. *Plutarchos von Chaeroneia*. Stuttgart: Aldred Druckenmüller Verlag in Stuttgart-Waldsee.

Zimmerman, Michael J. 2015. "Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic Value." *SEP*. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/value-intrinsic-extrinsic/.